

MODERN PHILOLOGY

VOLUME XXXIV

November 1936

NUMBER 2

THE WÆGMUNDINGS—SWEDES OR GEATS?

W. F. BRYAN

WAS Wiglaf, the devoted young retainer of Beowulf in the final encounter with the dragon, a Geat or a Swede? Within the last twenty years or so the conclusion seems to have become pretty general that although the Swedes were the bitterest enemies of the Geats, the most faithful follower of the king of the Geats and apparently his successor on the Geatish throne was a Swede. Further, the tendency of most recent Beowulfian scholarship is to regard the Wægmundings, the family or clan to which both Beowulf and Wiglaf belonged, as having both Swedish and Geatish branches¹ or even as being Swedish.² And even further, it has been urged that Ecgþeow, Beowulf's father, was a Swede.³ These hypotheses of the Swedish or semi-Swedish origin of Wiglaf, or even of Beowulf and Wiglaf, are apparently offered as the most satisfactory explanations of three circumstances. The first is that Wiglaf's father Weohstan was a follower of Onela, the king of the Swedes, in the war between Onela and Heardred, the king of the Geats; and in this war Weohstan killed Eanmund, Onela's rebellious nephew, who was being supported by Heardred, and Heardred was slain by the Swedes.⁴ The second is that Wiglaf himself is called *lēod Scylfinga*, that is, "a man [or "prince"] of the Swedes" (vs. 2603). The third is that Beowulf and Wiglaf (and

¹ See Klaeber, introduction to his edition of *Beowulf* (1928), p. xlv.

² Johannes Hoops, *Kommentar zum Beowulf* (Heidelberg, 1932), pp. 276-77.

³ Edith Wardale, "Beowulf: the nationality of Ecgþeow," *MLR*, XXIV (1929), 322.

⁴ See *Beowulf*, vss. 2379-88 and 2611-19.

of course Wiglaf's father Weohstan) were members of the same family, the Wægmundings. Beowulf's last words, addressed to Wiglaf, are:

þū eart endelāf ūsses cynnes,
Wægmundinga; ealle wyrd forswēop
mīne māgas tō metodsceafte,
eorlas on elne; ic him after sceal [vss. 2813-16]

But very serious difficulties confront the hypothesis that the Wægmundings were a Swedish family or a family having its roots among the Swedes as well as among the Geats. There is not the slightest hint in the epic that the Wægmundings as a family had any roots or possessions in Sweden; but there is a clear statement concerning the estate of this family in the land of the Geats. Wiglaf is kindled to his valiant support of Beowulf in the desperate contest with the fire-drake by his recollection of the obligations to Beowulf under which he lay:

Gemunde ǣ ǣ āre þē hē him ƿ forgeaf,
wīcstede weligne Wægmundinga,
folcrihta gehwyle, swā his fæder āhte [vss. 2606-08]

The phrase *wīcstede weligne Wægmundinga* seems clearly to refer to the ancestral holding or fief of the family, and the additional *folcrihta gehwyle, swā his fæder āhte* strongly confirms this interpretation: Wiglaf had succeeded his father in the family seat. As this succession had been granted by Beowulf, the king of the Geats, it is obvious that the ancestral home of the Wægmundings was in the land of the Geats. Since Beowulf, the king of the Geats, is a Wægmunding, as are Wiglaf and his father Weohstan, since there is a perfectly clear implication that the ancestral seat of the Wægmundings lay in the land of the Geats, and since there is nowhere in the poem any association of this family as a family with the land or race of the Swedes, the conclusion seems inescapable that the Wægmundings were not Swedes but Geats.

This conclusion is reinforced by the following considerations. The latter part of the poem is filled with accounts of the active hostility between Geats and Swedes, in the course of which Heardred, the king of the Geats, was killed. Heardred was succeeded on the Geatish throne by Beowulf, and this succession apparently came not as the result of a violent coup but as a normal event, and it was promptly followed by Beowulf's avenging Heardred's death upon his Swedish foes (vss. 2379-96). Beowulf is represented then as ruling his people

successfully and with no hint of factional or even individual hostility toward him from the Geats whom he ruled. If Beowulf's family, the Wægmundings, had been Swedish—much more, if, as Miss Wardale urges, Beowulf's father had been a Swede—this course of events would appear incredible. From the account of Swedish-Geatish hostility as given in the poem as well as from what is known of the ultimate fate of the Geats it is apparent that the warfare between the two peoples constituted really a national struggle and was not merely a series of contests between individual kings. Amid this violent and long-continued struggle between the two peoples it is hardly conceivable that after the death of Hygelac in his Frankish raid the widowed queen Hygd could have offered the Geatish throne to Beowulf (vss. 2369-72) if the latter's family, the Wægmundings, had been Swedish; it is only slightly less credible than that a member of a Swedish family could have quietly succeeded to the Geatish throne when his predecessor had been slain on the battlefield by the Swedes. Finally, it appears that Beowulf just before his death names Wiglaf, another Wægmunding, as his successor to the Geatish crown:

Nū ic on mǣðma hord mīne bebohte
frōde feorhlege, fremmað gēna
lēoda þearfe; ne mæg ic hēr leng wesan [vss. 2799-2801]

Surely the Wægmundings—Beowulf, Wiglaf, Weohstan—are Geats, not Swedes.

Of course, argument of this inferential character is open to objections. If the Wægmundings, a family to which Beowulf and Wiglaf and (by natural implication) Wiglaf's father Weohstan belonged, were Geatish, one might argue that in what constituted a long-continued racial or national contest between Geats and Swedes, it would be difficult to see how Weohstan, a Geat of the same family as Beowulf who became king of the Geats, could have achieved great and honorable distinction through his service to a Swedish king who was fighting the Geats. But in view of what has been urged above, this situation seems much less incredible than that Beowulf and the Wægmundings could be Swedes.

It seems to me that in the more recent discussion the personal, individual nature of a retainer's attachment to his lord has been largely overlooked, and that there has been a tendency to substitute for this

personal allegiance the modern idea of national loyalty; that is, a tendency not to consider Weohstan, for example, as primarily a personal follower of Onela, his particular lord, but as a Swede, a member of the nation of which Onela was king. In opposition to this more recent trend of opinion, Chadwick was right, I think, in emphasizing the strength of the personal tie between retainer and lord, a relationship much more binding than merely membership in the same folk or nation. And he was right too, I think, in considering Weohstan, the father of Wiglaf, as a Geat.⁵

There is a brief passage in the *Bēowulf* the significance of which, so far as I know, has not attracted the attention it deserves in this connection. Beowulf in his long review of his life, just before the actual beginning of the fight with the dragon, gives an account (vss. 2472-89) of the bitter strife between the Swedes and the Geats, in the course of which Hæðcynn, Hygelac's immediate predecessor on the Geatish throne, was slain, as was also the Swedish king Ongenpeow. Then follows Beowulf's proud boast of his service to his own particular lord and patron, Hygelac:

Ic him þā māðmas þē hē mē sealde
geald æt gūðe swā mē gifeðe wæs,
lēohtan sweorde; hē mē land forgeaf,
eard ēðelwyn. Næs him ænig þearf
þæt hē tō Gifðum oððe tō Gār-Denum
oððe in Swiorice sēcean þurfe
wyrsan wīgfreca, weorðe gecypan;
symle ic him on fēðan beforan wolde
āna on orde [vss. 2490-98]

⁵ H. M. Chadwick, *The heroic age* (Cambridge, 1912), pp. 329-30: "That Wiglaf whose bravery is said to be 'inbred' was the son of a certain Weohstan, whose great achievement was the slaying of the Swedish prince Eanmund. Yet Eanmund was at this time apparently under the protection of Heardred, king of the Geatas, who also lost his life in the same war. Weohstan, however, though he belonged to the Geatas, was in the service of Onela, their enemy. It would seem then that he was fighting against his own nation. Such cases appear to have been by no means uncommon in the Teutonic Heroic Age. For it was customary at that time for young noblemen to take service under foreign princes; and the obligations which personal service imposed were held to be superior to all others."

At another place in this same work (p. 350) Chadwick states further: "Another characteristic of these retinues which deserves notice is the fact that they were not always composed of born subjects of the king. Bede (*H.E.*, III, 14) says that Oswine, the popular king of Deira, attracted young noblemen to his service from all sides; and in the Heroic Age such cases appear to have been frequent. Perhaps the most striking case in the poems is that of Weohstan, who took service under the Swedish king Onela and consequently became involved in hostilities against his own nation."

The significance of the reference to Hygelac's obtaining warriors from the Gepidae or the Danes or the Swedes is obvious. The implication is clear that if Beowulf's valorous loyalty had not rendered unnecessary the service of foreign retainers, the king of the Geats might well have supported himself by attaching to his service retainers from wholly different races or nations than his own. Especially in point in this discussion is the implication that he might have engaged a champion *in Swiorice*. That is, the king who had succeeded to the throne of the Geats because his older brother had been slain in battle by the Swedes might well have supported himself on the throne by engaging warriors from among the Swedes. There can be no clearer indication of the personal character of the attachment between king and retainer or of the possibility that a king might have in his retinue warriors attracted from the tribe or nation that constituted his own most dangerous foe.

If, then, Hygelac, king of the Geats, in case of need might have taken into his service warriors "tō Gifðum, oððe tō Gār-Denum, oððe in Swiorice," the Swedish king Onela might equally well have attached to himself the Geat Weohstan.

Weohstan's great exploit in Onela's service, it will be recalled, was the slaying of Onela's rebellious nephew Eanmund (vss. 2611-19) in warfare in which King Heardred of the Geats supported the rebellious brothers Eanmund and Eadgils against Onela and in which Heardred also lost his own life (vss. 2379-88). After Beowulf succeeded Heardred on the Geatish throne, he supported Eadgils in the latter's successful attempt to overthrow Onela (vss. 2391-96). With the death of Onela and presumably the accession of Eadgils to the Swedish throne, there could be no place in Sweden for Weohstan, who had slain Eadgil's brother; and the natural presumption is that he returned to his ancestral home among the Geats with the arms and armor which he had taken from Eanmund and which Onela had then given him. At least the poem asserts that at his death he left to his young son *mid Gēatum* this famous war-gear, together with his other great possessions (vss. 2620-25).

But if Weohstan and his son Wiglaf were Geats, why should Wiglaf be called *lēod Scylfinga*, that is, a "man [or "prince"] of the Swedes"? A not unreasonable answer, it seems to me, may be found in the circumstance that up to the time when Wiglaf supported Beowulf so

gallantly against the fire-drake he had won no name for himself, whereas his father had won great fame and high place among the Swedes. The poem states that until the encounter with the dragon, Wiglaf was a wholly untried youth who had not previously even engaged in fight:

bā wæs	forma sið
geongan cēpan	þæt hē gūðe ræs
mid his frēodryhtne	fremman sceolde [vss. 2625-27]

His father, on the other hand, had signally distinguished himself in the service of the Swedish king Onela by slaying Eanmund, the rebellious nephew of the latter. The war-gear used by the young Wiglaf in his first fight was that which his father Weohstan had taken from Eanmund and in accordance with early Teutonic custom had offered to his lord, Onela. The latter, apparently as a mark of especial favor, had then given to Weohstan this equipment—*brūnfāgne helm, hringde byrnan, ealdsweord etonisc*. Clearly Weohstan's feat was regarded as no ordinary one.⁶ The inference is wholly reasonable that as a result of his deed he gained a high place among the retainers of the king of the Swedes and a great name among his native Geats. The inference is also reasonable that the father's fame and position as a great Swedish noble might lead to speaking of his young son, who had as yet made no name for himself, as *lēod Scyflinga*. This latter inference may seem to be supported by the fact that the term *lēod Scyflinga* is applied to Wiglaf in verse 2603 and a detailed account of his father's great exploit follows very closely thereafter, in verses 2611-19.

The evidence in the poem thus seems to make it altogether probable that Weohstan was not a native Swede but a Geat who was attached to the Swedish king as a personal retainer, and that the Wæg-mundings—Beowulf, Weohstan, and Wiglaf—were a Geatish family.⁷

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

⁶ See vss. 2609-22.

⁷ An additional minor point deserves a word of comment. The clear implication in Beowulf's speech (see above, p. 117) that Hygelac, the king of the Geats, might have supported himself, if there had been need, by attracting to his service warriors from the Danes or the Gepidae or even from among the Swedes makes wholly unnecessary the assumption by Belden, approved by Klaeber, of a foreign or pro-Danish party at the Swedish court to account for the presence of Wulfgar, *Wendla Lēod*, as an honored retainer of the Danish king Hroðgar (*Beowulf*, vss. 348-50). See H. M. Belden, "Onela the Scyfling and Ali the Bold," *MLN*, XXIV (1913), 149-53; and Klaeber's introduction to his edition of *Beowulf*, p. xliv.

THE POETRY OF JOHANNES BEVERUS WITH
EXTRACTS FROM HIS *TRACTATUS DE*
BRUTO ABBREVIATO

JACOB HAMMER

IN MY paper, "Note on a manuscript of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*," printed in the *Philological quarterly*,¹ I called attention to "poetic lines of some interest and value"² which I identified as the product of the pen of Johannes Beverus, known also under the name of John of London.³

Beverus, following the custom of his age of compiling chronicles, wrote, among other works, a condensed version of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*.⁴ This version bears the title of *Tractatus de Bruto abbreviato*, as can be seen from MS Rawlinson B 150, No. 5, folio 8v (Bodleian Library, late thirteenth century).⁵ In MS Harley 641, No. 4, folio 8v (British Museum, late thirteenth century), we read: *Incipiunt capitula Bruti abbreviati*; on folio 9r, however, we find in a fifteenth-century hand the caption: *Cronica Ioannis Beveri*, a title which Fletcher⁶ preferred to follow. A third MS, Cotton Titus D XII (British Museum, fourteenth century), bears no title.

¹ XII (1933), 225-34. I shall refer to this paper as *PQ*.

² *Ibid.*, p. 230.

³ For biographical and literary references see Thomas D. Hardy, *Descriptive catalogue relating to the history of Great Britain and Ireland*, III, 281-82 (cf. pp. 283, 309, and 363); II, 473-74; I, 359-60 = II, 473-74; above all, see *DNB*, XXIX, 449, and *Chronicles of the reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, ed. William Stubbs, introd., pp. xi-xviii ("Roll series," Vol. LXXVI, Part II [London, 1883]); also John Bale, *Index Britanniae scriptorum*, ed. R. L. Poole and M. Bateson ("Anecdota Oxoniensia" [Oxford, 1902]), p. 182.

⁴ Cf. R. H. Fletcher, *The Arthurian material in the chronicles, etc.* (Boston, 1906), p. 169 and n.; p. 175; *PQ*, p. 231.

⁵ See also fol. 8r: *Incipiunt capitula Bruti abbreviati*. Fletcher (p. 177) says that this manuscript "seems to resemble the chronicle of Johannes Beverus, and has Latin verses at intervals, some of them, at least, the same as his." This is not the case. It will be seen below that the verses in MS Rawlinson are practically the same. Having compared this manuscript with MS Harley, I am in a position to assert that MS Rawlinson was copied from MS Harley. Cf. the titles of both manuscripts: *Incipiunt capitula Bruti abbreviati*. There are, as will be seen, differences in MS Cotton Titus D XII, and it would seem that Fletcher confused the latter with the Rawlinson manuscript (see below, p. 124).

⁶ P. 175.

As far as I know, the *Tractatus de Bruto abbreviato* is found only in these three manuscripts. In referring to them I shall use the following *signa*: Rawlinson = *R*; Harley = *H*; Cotton Titus = *C*. As I shall have to use some variants from MS Fonds Latin 4126, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, discussed in my previous paper, I shall refer to it as *M*.⁷

Since the publication of the paper referred to above, I have studied the three manuscripts containing Beverus' compilation of Geoffrey's *Historia* and the poems scattered through it. The latter, I believe, deserve publication,⁸ because they show how the reading of the *Historia* caught the fancy of Beverus, and what personal reactions this reading evoked. The purpose of the present paper, however, is two-fold. First, it aims to give the entire corpus, or rather corpusculum, of Beverus' poetry, as contrasted with the *disiecta membra* presented in my former paper. Of course, this will entail repetition of some lines already published, but such repetition is unavoidable if we are to have an entity. Second, it aims to give a specimen of Beverus' handiwork as a compiler. Fletcher, in his classification of chroniclers in whose works Arthurian material is found, assigns Beverus' work to Class 3a:⁹

3. Those who take from Geoffrey everything (or almost everything) that they say about the whole period covered by his *History*,—

a) Giving a summary, long or short, of his narrative (a numerous class, represented by the *Memoriale* of Walter of Coventry).

Since the works of several compilers of the same class have been published, there is, I think, all the more reason why we should have a specimen of Beverus' method and handiwork.

Beverus divided his treatise into two books, of which the first bears the title referred to above, and ends with the death of King Cadualadrus. It covers, so to say, Geoffrey's *Historia*, and it is with this part that we are concerned here. The second book deals with the kings *post obitum Kadwaladri* and the *Conquestus Angliae*. Both books are subdivided into chapters, and *H* and *R* open with a table of contents giving the titles of the *capitula*. For the sake of convenience, to enable the reader to follow Beverus, I shall adhere to the traditional

⁷ I shall also employ the following abbreviations. *corr.* = corrected; *in marg.* = in margin; *om.* = omitted; *m²* = *manu secunda*.

⁸ *PQ*, p. 231.

⁹ *P*, 170; cf. *p.* 175 (ca. 1306).

division of Geoffrey's *Historia* into twelve books, and I shall give as a specimen Beverus' outline of the entire first book. This, I believe, will suffice to give an idea of how Beverus handled Geoffrey.

Expliciunt Capitula. Incipit Tractatus de Bruto Abbreviato (HR)

I. *De Aenea et Ascanio filio suo (HR)*

Fluxit ab Aenea primum Romana propago
insimul et Britones, Saxonia protulit Anglos.
Haec patet in lingua niveoque colore; sed illa
olim pagana fuerat simul Anglia tota.

Aeneas cum Ascanio filio fugiens excidium urbis, anno tertio post bellum 5
Troianum, Italiam navigio adiit et ibidem bello congressus est cum Turno
rege Latinorum. Quo devicto regnum Italiae adeptus est et Laviniam, filiam
Latini regis, duxit in uxorem, quoniam ei fuerat in auxilium contra Turnum.

II. *De Silvio, filio Ascanii (HR)*

Tandem mortuo Aenea regnavit Ascanius, filius eius, et Albam civitatem
condidit super Tyberim. Iste genuit silvium, qui nesciente patre duxit quan- 10
dam neptem Laviniae et facta est gravida. Quod cum pater suus comperit,
quaesivit a magis de quo partu gravida foret. Qui dixerunt: "De puero, qui
patrem et matrem interficeret." Et ita accidit. Mater enim eius in partu
mortua est.

III. *De Bruto et Corineo (HR)*

Natus vero puer dictus est Brutus. Qui cum iuvenis probus esset, ivit 15
venatum cum patre suo et ex improvise patrem sagitta percussit, putans
cervum percutere. Mortuo autem patre depulsus est a parentibus suis et
missus in exilium usque in Graeciam ubi invenit Helenum, filium Priami et
multos alios nobiles, qui tenebantur in servitute sub Pandraso rege et sub
Pirro, filio Achillis, qui multos tenuit in carcere ulciscendo mortem patris
sui. Brutus autem cum compertus esset quod foret de genere Troianorum, 20
receptus est ab Heleno, iam sene, et ab aliis et cum illis morabatur. Qui in
tantam crevit audaciam et probitatem quod omnibus praevaleret in militia
et facetia et amore patriae. Divulgabatur eius fama per omnes nationes.
Omnes Troiani profugi ad ipsum confluebant, orantes ut ipsos a servitute
liberaret, dicentes quod hoc facile facere posset. Brutus itaque adquevit 25
petitioni eorum et factus est dux eorum, mandavitque Pandraso regi quod
Troianos qui liberi sunt natione et regales genere, licet modo captivi, sub
mera libertate regeret, aut ipsi a regno suo abirent, malentes herbis et radici-
bus in deserto vivere quam deliciis in terra sua sub servitute, iuxta illud:

Sit michi libertas potius maciesque famesque 30
quam sim servili condicione satur!

Quod cum audisset rex Pandrasus, ultra modum iratus est, multum ad-
mirans in tantam eos irrupisse audaciam. Fecit igitur exercitum congregari,

ut Troianos et Brutum obrueret. Quem exercitum Brutus de nocte invasit et regem cepit. Cum quo tandem tale pactum iniit quod acciperet in uxorem unicam filiam regis nomine Ignogem et septem naves plenas argento et auro, frumento, vino et oleo et libertatem haberet exeundi a regno suo ut per universum orbem patriam sibi cum ceteris Troianis quaereret. Quod ita factum est. Duxit autem Brutus secum ducentas naves repletas viris et armis ceterisque necessariis et multo tempore insulas Oceani scrutando primo venit in quandam insulam desertam ubi in templo Dianae ipsi sacrificavit et in haec verba, vel similia, illam affatus est:

Diva potens nemoris, terror silvestribus apris
cui licet anfractus ire per aethereos
infernascue domos, terrestria iura resolvis
edic quas terras nos habitare velis;
dic certam sedem qua te venerabor in aevum,
qua tibi virgineis templa dicabo choris.

Haec dicens novies obdormivit, hora noctis quasi tertia haec audiens:

Brute, sub occasu solis, trans Gallica regna *Continuatio (R)*
insula in Oceano est, undique clausa mari;
insula in Oceano est habitata gigantibus olim,
nunc deserta quidem, gentibus apta tuis.
Hanc pete: namque tibi sedes erit illa perhennis,
hic fiet natis altera Troia tuis;
hic de prole tua reges nascentur et illis
totius terrae subditus orbis erit.

Post haec, cursu triginta dierum venerunt ad Africam, deinde ad columnas Herculis ubi Syrenes viderunt, a quibus vix evasi, invenerunt iuxta litora quatuor generationes de exilibus Troiae ortas, qui fugam Antenoris comitatae fuerant. Quorum dux erat Corineus, vir mansuetus, miles mirae probitatis et audaciae, qui cum eis et pro eis multas pertulit angustias. Qui cum comperit Brutum esse Troianum statim confoederati sunt et relinquens Corineus insulam illam cum viginti navibus secutus est Brutum. Tribus diebus velificando consumptis venerunt ad Aquitanniam, ubi regnabat Gofarius Pictus, rex Pictavensium, cum quo bellum iniit et auxilio Corinei triumpho potitus, fecit quoddam castrum ubi nunc est civitas Turonis, dicta a Turno, nepote Bruti, ibi interfecto et sepulto. Cui nullus miles par erat, excepto Corineo, qui plures gigantes interfecit. Inde Brutus Aquitanniam reliquit, quoniam quatuor reges ipsum undique infestabant, et ambiens extremitates Oceani tandem applicuit in Totonesio litore, in insula quae tunc Albion vocabatur, plena gigantibus, quos Brutus et Corineus ad cavernas montium fugaverunt et multos occiderunt, quoniam Corineus super omnia dilexit cum gigantibus pugnare. Quibus fugatis terras coluerunt et villas fundaverunt. Et Brutus, a nomine suo terram illam Britanniam vocavit; Corineus autem partem illam quam Brutus ei dederat, a nomine suo Cornubiam vocitavit. Diviso autem regno Brutus iuxta flumen Tamense civitatem aedificavit, vocans eam Troiam

Novam, quae postea per corruptionem linguae dieta fuit Trinovantum, quam multo post tempore Lud, frater Cassibellanni, qui cum Iulio Caesare dimicavit, regnum adeptus, muris et turribus nobilissime cinxit, vocarique iussit 80
Kaer Lud. Unde orta est contentio inter ipsum et fratrem suum Nennium quia nomen Troiae voluit delere. *Incidens (HR)*: Regnabat in Iudaea tunc Hely sacerdos et archa testamenti capta est a Phylisteis. *Aliud Incidens (HR)*: Regnabant etiam in Troia filii Hectoris, expulsis posteris Antenoris et in Italia Silvius Aeneas, Aeneae filius, patruus Bruti, Latinorum tertius. *Con-* 85
tinuatio historiae Britonum (HR).

[4. *These four lines occur only in C and M; in C, however, they have been added by a different hand from that which wrote the manuscript.* 1. *Romana*] Ioviana M. 3. niveoque colore] mutuoque dolore M; sed] at M. 4. fuerat simul] simul fuit M. 5. anno tertio om. C; this date is not mentioned by Geoffrey, and is one of these "trivial additions" to which Fletcher refers, p. 175; cf. also notes to ll. 21 and 36 and nn. 11 and 17. 10. silvium C; filium HR (corr. m₂ to silvium R; silvium also in marg. m₂); duxit] dixit H. 11. suus] filius C. 13. interficeret] interficet C; accidit] event C. 14. Natus vero] et natus C; probus esse] esset et probus C. 15. venatum—suo] patre suo in venationem C. 16. cervum] servum H. 17. Priami] Priami regis C. 20. foret] esset C. 21. iam sene is not mentioned by Geoffrey. 23. factia] militari factia C; amore] in amore C. 25. dicentes] dicens H; hoc facile] haec f. H; ex facili hoc C; posset] possit H. 28. libertate] liberalitate C. 29. in deserto vivere] vivere in deserto C. 30. famesque] fames M. 31. satur] sator M; cf. PQ, p. 251, n. 51. 32. rex P.] P. rex C. 33. In—irrupisse] ipso in tantam irrupisse C; igitur] etiam C; exercitum] e. suum C. 34. et Brutum] cum Bruto C; invasit] cum sociis suis invasit C. 36. Ignogem] Ignogem RC; the seven ships are, again, *Beverus'* addition. This number must be a reminiscence of the "Aeneid." Aeneas reached Carthage with seven shattered ships out of the entire number of twenty (see Vergil Aen. i. 170. 381); cf. also l. 64; argento et auro] auro et argento C. 37. haberet] habent R. 38. orbem] mundum C; quaerent] quaerent HR. 39. Brutus secum] s. Brutus C. Geoffrey's number is 384; cf. his *Historia* i. 11. 40. tempore insulas] tempore abiit in insulas C; scrutando] scrutando et multa passus est pericula ut Cires(?) et Syrenes C. 40–57 primo venit . . . orbis erit om. C. 41. ipsi] pse R. 43. terror] necron H. 52. habitata om. H. 58–61. Post haec . . . comitatae fuerant] et plurima bella egit cum gigantibus. Tandem venit ab mare Tirenum et ibi in quadam insula invenit quatuor nationes Troianorum qui comitabantur fugam Antenoris C. 61. erat om. H. 62. audaciae] audaciis H (corr. m₂ to audacie); cum eis et pro eis] pro eis et cum eis C; pertulit] protulit H. 63. Corin.] Corineus C. 66. Corinei] Corimel C. 68. Corineo] Corimeo C. 69. Interfecti] occidit probitate militiae C; reliquit] reliquit C. 70. quatuor reges: Geoffrey (*Historia* i. 13) speaks of "duodecim reges," 71. Tot. lit.] lit. Tot. C; tunc—vocabatur] vocabatur tunc Albyon C. 72. Corineus] Corimeus C. 73. Corineus] Corimeus C. 74. et villas] villas C. 75. vocavit] appellavit C; Corineus] Corimeus C. 76. Brutus ei] et Brutus C; a nomine—Cornubiam] Cornubiam a nomine suo C; Diviso: corr. m₂ from divisa in H; divisa R. 77–85. Brutus . . . Latiorum tertius] affectavit Brutus civitatem aedificare et iuxta flumen Tamense civitatem aedificavit et vocavit eam Novam Troiam, quae postea in lingua britannica dicta est Trinovantum; et aliud castrum statuit in occidente quod vocavit Kaepuld C. 79. frater] super H; Cassibellanni] Cassibellani R. 85. Silvius] Silius (corr. m₂ to Silvius) H.

The following observations are in order: Beverus dispenses entirely with the preface, dedication, and description of Britain (*Historia* i. 1–2) and begins with the narrative proper (i. 3).¹⁰ The narrative, however, follows the original closely, eliminating, of course, some details; for example, Brutus' address to Anacletus and the latter's exploit, the details leading to the capture of King Pandrasus, the speeches

¹⁰ Some manuscripts of Geoffrey's *Historia* begin in the same way.

of Memprius and Pandrasus and the fight between Corineus and Goemagog, etc. What Beverus has done in the first book he did in all the others incorporated in his *Brutus abbreviatus*, as will be seen from other excerpts which I shall quote. On the other hand, we find some details not mentioned by Geoffrey;¹¹ for example, the reception of Brutus by Helenus *iam sene*, and the seven ships laden with gold and silver, a reminiscence of the *Aeneid*, as I have pointed out (see critical note to ll. 21 and 36).

I must now come back to *R* and Fletcher's statement, which I have quoted in note 5. A careful reading of the outline of the first book which I have given shows a different situation. In the first place, the four opening lines occur only in *C* (and *M*), but not in *H* or *R*. It will be seen below that *C* has some poetic lines not found in either *H* or *R*. The critical notes, furthermore, make clear the difference between *C* and *HR*, and it is seen that except for some scribal errors *H* and *R* are the same. Hence the statement of Fletcher does not and cannot apply to MS Rawlinson (= *R*), but only to Cotton Titus D XII (= *C*). Fletcher, therefore, confused *R* and *C*, and his statement properly applies to *C* only.¹²

BOOK II

The division of Britain by the three sons of Brutus is described as follows:

Et sic tres reges tribus addunt nomina terris
deque suo vocitat nomine quisque suam.¹³

After Aganippus' request to marry Cordeilla, we find the following lines:¹⁴

Sed quia stare statu stabili mundana recusant
tramite transverso prospera lapsa ruunt.

1-2. Not in *M*. 2. tramite transverso: cf. Livy II. 39.3: transversis tramitibus; Petronius IV. 3: quod non

¹¹ Cf. Fletcher, p. 175; cf. also notes to ll. 5, 21, 36 of the text and n. 17.

¹² To show further points of similarity between *H* and *R*, the following will suffice: Brutus Viride Scutum, the oldest son of Ebraucus, appears in *H* and *R* under the name of "Brutus Vert escu." The city of Kaerleil is spelled in both "Kersil." Both *H* and *R* have also "Constantinus" for "Conanus," and "cenatus" for "senatus." These (and I could quote more examples) are certainly no coincidences and bear out my assertion made in n. 5.

¹³ Cf. *PQ*, p. 231, n. 32.

¹⁴ Beverus abbreviates as follows: "latissimam possideo terram, aurum et argentum sufficienter. Solam posco puellam. Quod ita factum est."

expectes, ex transverso fit—et supra nos Fortuna negotia curat; see also Sallust *B. Jug.* vi. 3: natura mortalium avida imperi . . . viros spe praedae transversos agit . . . ; Seneca *De vita beata* xv. 6: debilitates et cetera ex transverso in vitam humanam incurrentia; *Ep. morales* viii. 4: cum coepit transversos agere felicitas; perhaps also Ovid *Tristia* v. 14. 29–30; p. lapsa ruunt: cf. Vergil *Aen.* vi. 310: lapsa cadunt folia; ix. 708: conlapsa ruunt . . . membra. . . .

In these lines Beverus prepares the reader for what is going to befall King Lear. After describing his misfortunes and his kind reception by Cordeilla and Aganippus, he aptly utters the following:

Cor quam femineum, mens quam generosa parenti
grata fit ingrato, miseretur non miserenti.

1–2. Not in *M.* 1. parenti] patenti *R.* 2. Cf. Publilius Syrus 570 (ed. J. W. Duff and A. M. Duff ["The Loeb classical library"]): Quam miser est cui est ingrata misericordia! Perhaps also Ovid *Heroides* xii. 81–82.

King Dunvallo, who according to Geoffrey (ii. 17), "leges quae Molmutinae dicebantur inter Britones statuit," but, according to Beverus, "leges Troianas erexit," is honored as follows:

Concors vivus erat, recipit Concordia templo
defunctum; concors tempus utrumque tenet
Annos concordes fecit sudore; quiescit
divae quam coluit, cultor, in aede sua.¹⁵

2. utrumque] utramque *HR.* 4. sua] sue *C.*

BOOK III

The reconciliation between Belinus and Brennius, brought about by their mother Tonwenna, is described by Beverus as follows:

Quod comperiens mater illorum [=their readiness to fight] interposuit se capillis sparsis, nudisque mamillis, quasi cum his verbis:

Proth dolor, hoc quid erit, quid vos mea viscera turbat?
fraternas acies quae mala causa movet?
Tota tenere nequit modo vos Britannia: quondam
vos tenuit venter unicus iste meus;
non vos maternae lacrimae, sparsique capilli,
nec quae, suxistis, ubera nuda movent?

5

3. Proth] Proh *CR*; hoc] haec *HR*; heu *M*; viscera] uscera *M*; turbat] turbant *HR.* 6. vos] nos *HR.* 8. suxistis] sugistis *M*; nuda] mea *H*; it was, however, deleted and in marg. *m₂* we find nuda.

¹⁵ Cf. *PQ*, p. 231, n. 33.

We come to King Gorbonianus.¹⁶ He, "vir morigeratus, qui pia mente deos coluit . . . memor paternae nequitiae [=of Morvid], iuxta illud:

Ut per iter morum pergas tu facta priorum
scribas; sit socii vita magistra tibi."

1-2. Found complete in *M* only; cf. *PQ*, p. 232 and n. 36. In *C* we find only: Ut per iter morum, et cetera.

King Elidurus, who *cognomine Pius dici meruit*, because of his conduct toward his brother Arthgallo, earns the following meed of praise:

Hoc nunc quis faceret quem non cessisse pigeret
quin potius raperet, quis sic pro fratre doleret?
Sed dispensat ita clemens deitas Eliduro
sorte triperitita bis tempore regna futuro.

1-4. Not in *M*. 1. nunc] modo *C*; quem non] quin eum *HR*. 4. triperitita corr. *ms* from bipertita in *H*. In *C* these four lines are not found in the text but on the bottom of fol. 6v; they seem to have been placed there by a different scribe.

BOOK IV

The feast of Cassibellaunus, in commemoration of his second victory over Caesar, at which "multa . . . et diversa sacrificia fecerunt et festa regalia XV diebus celebraverunt,"¹⁷ was marred by the fight between the princes, Cuelinus and Hirelglas, "quoniam":

Rebus in humanis non est sincera voluptas:
miscentur laetis tristia saepe iocis.

1. est om. *H*; sincera] scincera *CHMR*. 2. laetis] iocis *M*; tristia corr. from tristicia in *H*. For comments see *PQ*, p. 232 and nn. 37-39.

The Claudius-Guiderius episode is illustrated as follows:

Fama loquax Romae Guidini verba revelat
corde nil claudens: tibi Claudii cuncta recludit.

1-2. Found in *M* only. Cf. *PQ*, p. 232 and nn. 40-41.

We come now to King Lucius. I shall give part of this chapter:
. Cui [=regi Coillo] successit filius suus Lucius, bonitatis paternae sedulus imitator.

Lucius in tenebris prius idola qui coluisti
ex merito celebris ex quo baptisma subisti.

¹⁶ This corrects my statement made *ibid.*, p. 232.

¹⁷ This period of time is not mentioned by Geoffrey; cf. n. 11.

Qui cum audisset de apostolis Ihesu Christi et de eorum miraculis, missis
epistolis Eleutherio Papae, petiit ab ipso Christianitatem. Papa autem misit 5
in Britanniam duos religiosos doctores, Faganum et Dunianum et plures alios
et in urbe Trinovantum baptizatus est rex et tota familia sua et postea maior
pars regni. . . . Tandem, mortuo Lucio, ortum est discidium inter Britones
quis regnaret, quoniam rex sine prole discessit. 10

Coelestis medici merito cura meruisti
omine felici locus baptismate Christi.

3-4. In *C* these lines are inserted in the wrong place; not found in *M*. 8. Trinovantum: not mentioned by Geoffrey. 9. Lucio] Lucio anno Domini CLVI *C*. 10. discessit] daccessit *CH*. 11-12. Not found in *CM*. 12. omine] omne *H*.

BOOK V

After the death of Carausius, the Romans, under the command of Allectus

Britones . . . vilissime tractaverunt. Unde Britones indignati Asclepiodotum . . . in regem erexerunt. Qui collecto exercitu Allectum adivit, qui iam in urbe Trinovantum, more gentis suae, patriis diis sacrificabat:

Arae Martis erant: Marti sacrat et male Martem
placat, nam Marte mane sequente cadit. 5

4. erant] arent *M*; sacrat] sacrant *M*. 5. placat] pacat *CM*; nam] quan *HR*; mane] male *M*; cf. *PQ*, p. 233 and n. 42; also Vergil *Aen.* xii. 410: et duro sub Marte cadentum.

The following two lines refer to King Conan's¹⁸ decision to forbid intermarriage between the British and Armoricians:

Non bene conveniunt, non se contraria miscent
sit ubi confluctus primaeque remotio formae.

1-2. Found in *M* only. Cf. *PQ*, p. 233 and nn. 43-44.

The death of Constantine, brother of Aldroenus, who is treacherously murdered by a Pict, calls forth the following reflection:

Cum mors sit certa, modus est incertus et hora:
omnibus est una mors, nunc mortis modus unus.

1-2. Cf. *PQ*, p. 233 and n. 45. 2. nunc] non *CM*.

BOOK VI

Vortimer, the son of Vortegirn "extraneos impugnavit aut occidit aut a patria fugavit et possessiones ereptas civibus restituit et in

¹⁸ Not Maximilianus', as I have stated by mistake in *PQ*, p. 233.

pace stabili sub cultura Christiana custodivit. Sed quia muliebris nequitia vix latere potest, noverca sua Ronwen procuravit eius interitum potu venenato. Unde versificator ait”:

Femina prima cibo mundum dampnavit at ista
potu confudit Anglica regna suo.

Wesseil dat laetos alios, letum dedit isti;

Wesseil laetitiam significare solet.

Patris erat primum Wesseil, natiq[ue] secundum
mors fuit utrumque per quod uterque perit.

1. impugnarit] imp. et omnes C. 3. pace stabili]s. pace C. 5. Unde—ait om. C. 6–11. Last poem in M. 6. Cf. PQ, p. 233 and n. 46; at] ac H. 7. Anglica] Anglia C. 8. Wesseil] Wesell H, Wessayl M; alios om. C; letum dedit: cf. PQ, p. 233, n. 47 and Juvenal x. 119; Lucan ix. 732; Ovid Her. 2. 147; Met. 1. 670 and passim; cf. 4. 462; Phaedrus i. 22. 9; iii. 16. 18; Vergil Aen. v. 806 and passim; cf. also xl. 872; 9. Wesseil] Wesell H, Wessayl M. 10. Wesseil] Wesheil H. 11. utrumque] utramque HR.

When Merlin had convinced King Vortegirn that his wizards “mendacium adinvenisse . . . ,” all were amazed and “putabant numen esse in Merlino”:

Iure stupent omnes hominem ventura referre
cum sit solius scire futura Dei.

1. ventura referre: cf. Vergil Aen. i. 309; exacta referre; Georg. i. 176; praecepta referre; Ovid Met. v. 146; ventura videre; xv. 557; oraque venturis aperire recentia fatis; Statius Theb. iii. 626–27; ventura . . . pandere. See also Gesta regum Britanniae (ed. Francisque-Michel) l. 2502; ventura evolvere fata.

BOOK VII

This book includes the *Prophetia Merlini*. Beverus left it intact. Not a single poetic line is found in it.

BOOK VIII

King Vortegirn, to be sure, deserves just punishment for his outrageous crimes. I quote Beverus again:

Vortiginus fugit in quoddam castrum super flumen Gwaie, ubi nunc est civitas Herefordiae et igne apposito combustum est castrum; erat enim ligneum et Vortiginus intus combustus est:

Iure dolum sequitur dolor et post seditionem
caedes; felici res mala fine caret.

1. flumen] fluvium C; Gwale] Guale C. 2. civitas Herefordiae: not mentioned in *Geoffrey*; combustum est] combustum C; castrum] castrum ipsum C; erat enim ligneum] ligneum enim erat C. 3. Vortig.] Vorteg. CR; intus om. C.

The treacherous bargain of Pascentius (Vortegirn's son) with the Saxon Eopa,¹⁹ to dispose of King Aurelius by means of a poisonous draught, an attempt in which Eopa succeeded, calls forth the following pathetic lines to which we may give the title, "On the power of bribery."²⁰

Humanum nichil est quod non sic praemia mutant:
muneris in manibus iura fidesque latent.
Salvat et occidit, iungit disiungit amicos,
dat paces, rumpit foedera, pacta novat,
iudicis excaecat oculos et inebriat aures,
fit ius iuris egens, lex sine lege iacet.

5

1. Humanum nichil: *Did Beverus have in mind the famous line of Terence, Homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto?* 2. Cf. Ovid *Heroides* ii. 31: iura, fides ubi nunc . . . ; Propertius iii. 13.49: auro pulsa fides, auro venalla iura, and perhaps Ovid *Met.* xi. 135: fide data munera solvit; Rutilius Namatianus *De reditu suo* i. 361: auro victa fides . . . ; Tiberianus ii. 19-20 (see below, n. 20): pudor . . . venditur auro . . . leges pietasque fidesque. 4. paces] pacem C. Cf. Horace *Epist.* i. 3. 35: fraternum rumpere foedus . . . ; Ovid *Heroides* iv. 17: socialla foedera rumpam . . . ; Vergil *Aen.* xii. 582: haec altera foedera rumpi; Sulpicius Lupercus *De cupiditate* 27 (see n. 20): honestum rumpere foedus; for pacta novat cf. Vergil *Aen.* v. 604: Fortuna fidem mutata novavit; Valerius Flaccus *Arg.* ii. 309: iura novant . . . 5. Cf. Petronius cxli. 5: excaecabat pecuniae ingens fama oculos animosque miserorum, and, *Vulgate, Exodus* xxiii. 8: Nec accipies munera, quae etiam excaecant prudentes, et subvertunt verba iustorum; Juvenal ix. 113: miseram vinosus inebriet aurem. 6. egens: *corr. from ege, in marg. ms H.* Cf. Ovid *Fasti* i. 217-18: in pretio pretium nunc est: dat census honores, census amicitias: pauper ubique iacet; cf. also *Met.* i. 17; Propertius iii. 13.50: aurum lex sequitur, mox sine lege pudor; Seneca *Epist.* cxv. 10; for sine lege see also Ovid *Met.* i. 90; i. 477; ii. 204; xi. 489.

¹⁹ In some manuscripts of Geoffrey the variant "Copa" is found.

²⁰ Classical and early Christian literature offer a great number of parallels to this theme. Cf. Publilius Syrus 506: "Pecunia (una) regimen est rerum omnium"; Horace *Epist.* i. 1. 52-53; i. 6. 37; Vergil *Aen.* iii. 56-57: "quid non mortalia pectora cogis, auri sacra fames"; also i. 349: "[Pygmalion] auri caecus amore"; Ovid *Amor.* iii. 8. 29: "nihil esse potentius auro"; *Met.* i. 140: "opes, inritamenta malorum"; see also Propertius iii. 13. 48; Tibullus i. 10. 7; Sallust *BC* x. 3; Seneca *Hyppol.* ii. 527-28: "auri . . . caecus cupido"; *Epist.* cxv. 10-14; Lucan iii. 119: "auri . . . amor"; Juvenal i. 112-13: "sanctissima divitiarum maiestas . . . funesta pecunia"; Petronius cxxxvii. 9: "quisquis habet nummos, secunda navigat aura"; Apuleius *Met.* ix. 18; Rutilius Namatianus i. 357-58: "materies vitilis aurum letale parandis; auri caecus amor ducit in omne nefas"; Tiberianus ii, esp. 18-21 (ed. and trans. J. W. Duff and A. M. Duff, in *Minor Latin poets* ["The Loeb classical library"]); Sulpicius Lupercus Servasius Iunior *De cupid.* (*ibid.*, pp. 576-80); for

The influences at play in molding the foregoing poem are clear from the notes. One may also observe that as far as the *munera* are concerned, the tone recalls vividly King Lear's words: "Interim dilixerunt me, sed magis munera mea. Nam abeuntibus muneribus et ipsi abierunt."²¹

BOOK X

No poem is found in Book IX, and Book X contains the last two. Again I shall quote a part of Beverus' outline of X. 3:

<Beduerus> accedens ad unum ignium audit ululatum nutricis . . . Helenae, quae tunc eandem Helenam a gigante timore affectam et oppressam . . . tumulo commendaverat et gigantem cum ipsa concubuisse confessa, videns eum, talibus verbis alloquitur, dicens:

O miser, o demens, quo te tua fata vocarunt?²²

Effuge, dum poteris, o periture brevi!

Te mors saeva manet, te dira pericula mortis,
dente giganteo dilacerandus eris.

2. eandem: in *H* tandem in text, but in marg. eandem ms. 3. tumulo] cimulo *C*. 4. talibus verbis] et talibus *C*; dicens: om. *C*. 5. demens: see Vergil *Ecl.* ii. 60: quem fugis, a, demens . . . ; and Ovid *Met.* iii. 641: quid facis, o demens? 6. periture] pariture *H*. For the sentiment here, that each mortal has his own set day, cf. Vergil *Georg.* iv. 496: fata vocant . . . ; *Aen.* x. 471-72: etiam sua Turnum fata vocant, metasque dati pervenit ad aevi; x. 438: mox illos sua fata manent . . . ; cf. also vi. 147, ix. 94; Ovid *Met.* vii. 605: morte fugant ultroque vocant venientia fata; *Heroides* vi. 28: me quoque fata vocant . . . ; *ibid.* vii. 1; cf. also Horace *Epodes* xvii. 62. 6. Effuge: cf. Ovid *Met.* x. 707; Vergil *Aen.* iii. 398, xi. 825; periture: cf. *ibid.* xi. 856; Ovid *Met.* iii. 579-80: o periture tuaque aliis documenta dature morte. . . . 7. Te—manet: cf. Vergil *Aen.* vii. 596-97: te triste manebit supplicium. . . .

We pass now to the last poem. After his victory over the Romans, King Arthur

adveniente . . . aestate, cum Romam adire affectaret, nuntiatur ei, Modredum regio diademate Britanniae insignitum, Guennaram reginam ne-

Dea pecunia see Arnobius *Adv. Gent.* iv. 9; Augustine *De civ. Dei* (ed. Weidman) iv. 21c; iv. 24b; vii. 3. 1; see also Boethius *De cons. phil.* ii. 5: "divitiae possidentibus persaepe nocuerunt. . . ."

²¹ *Historia* ii. 12.

²² With this cf. *Gesta regum Britanniae*, ll. 3627-32:

"Conspectoque viro: 'Que te demencia, dixit,
Duxit in hunc montem? Miseranda morte peribis
Hoste sub infando, presenti nocte. Recede
Dum licet. . . ."

fando sibi matrimonio copulasse. Qui (= *Arthurus*) commotus in iram talia fertur protulisse:

O Deus, invadet totiens cur femina mundum? 5
 femineae fidei foedera nulla manent.
 Femina fraus phalerata, latens fel melle linitum,
 fronsque columbina, caudaque viperea.
 Hac Priamus, Priamique domus, Paris, Hector, Achilles, 10
 Ajax, Aesonides, totaque Troia perit.
 Femina Sansonem destruxerat, Hippolytumque,
 Herculeas vires et Salomonis opes.
 Mundum perdomui, dominoque suo mihi servit,
 indomitata manet femina sola mihi!

For the theme cf. perhaps Publilius Syrus 365: *Malo in consilio feminae vincunt viros*, and Juvenal vi. 242: *nulla fere causa est in qua non femina litem moverit*. 1. Romam: *om. C.* 5. O Deus: cf. Vergil *Aen.* i. 372: *O dea . . .*; curj cum C. 6. femineae: for position see *ibid.* vii. 345; Ovid *Met.* vi. 680; Ovid *Heroides* ii. 31: *iura, fides ubi nunc, commissaque dextera dextrae. . . . 7. Cf. Terence Phormio* iii. 2. 15 (500: *phaleratis ducas dictis me. . . . 7-8. fel . . . viperea: perhaps a reminiscence of Ovid Ep. ex Ponto* i. 2. 16: *omnia vipereo spicula felle linunt; Met.* ii. 777: *pectora felle virent . . . and Vergil Aen.* vii. 351: *vipeream inspirans animam*. 9. Priamique: cf. *ibid.* ii. 56: *Priamique arx alta*; iii. 1: *Priamique . . . gentem*; for Priami domus see Cicero *Tusc. disp.* iii. 44, where he quotes a passage from Ennius, containing the phrase "*o Priami domus*"; Vergil imitated the latter, see Vergil *Aen.* ii. 241. 10. Aesonides: cf. Ovid *Heroides* vi. 25, 103; xii. 16; *Met.* vii. 164; viii. 411; totaque Troia perit: cf. Ovid *Heroides* i. 4: *vix Priamus tanti totaque Troia fuit*, and *Met.* xiii. 404: *Troia simul Priamusque cadunt*. 12. cf. *ibid.* xii. 554-55: *Herculeis . . . viribus. . . .*

The blending of classical and biblical elements can be observed in these lines. But, above all, it was Vergil who inspired them. "*Varium et mutabile semper femina*" (*Aen.* iv. 569-70) is the theme. However, Beverus does not copy Vergil slavishly but shows himself a clever *remanieur* of a Vergilian motif, and in this respect he greatly resembles his master Geoffrey.²³

In the *Aeneid* i. 37-38, 46-48, Juno says:

. . . . mene incepto desistere victam
 nec posse Italia Teucrorum avertere regem?
 ast ego, quae divum incedo regina, Iovisque
 et soror et coniunx, una cum gente tot annos
 bella gero. . . .

²³ How deeply Geoffrey was indebted to Vergil has been pointed out by Hans Tausendfreund, in his dissertation, *Vergil und Gottfried von Monmouth* (Halle, 1913), and Edmond Faral in his *La Légende arthurienne* (Paris, 1929). II, *passim*. Geoffrey takes motifs and situations from Vergil, transposes and remodels them, and fits them so cleverly into the fabric of his narrative that he is the greatest *remanieur* known.

Juno, though queen of the gods, is to resign her purpose and is unable to turn Aeneas from Italy. She, a goddess, is waging a battle against a man. This motif is utilized by Beverus, but in a remodeled form. Arthur, the great conqueror and hero, lord of a mighty kingdom, not a homeless exile like Aeneas, is thwarted in his plans by a woman, his own wife, and realizes that notwithstanding all his conquests and power

indomitata manet femina sola mihi!

The situation, therefore, can be illustrated as follows:

Juno	Guenuara
Arthur	Aeneas

There is also another point reminiscent of the *Aeneid*. In iv. 103, Juno says to Venus, with whom she was plotting:

liceat <Didoni> Phrygio servire marito. . . .

Let Dido serve a Phrygian husband, Dido a queen of a tiny realm! But to Arthur *mundus servit*, which he conquered. No goddesses, but Modred and his wife conspired against him.

These, then, are the products of Johannes Beverus' Muse, found in his compilation. Fletcher (p. 175) says: "[Beverus] . . . sometimes inserts Latin verses, especially on the faithlessness of women, apropos of Guenuara. . . ." Fletcher's statement, however, is one-sided. In the collection of our "versificator" there are four poems in which reference to women is made, namely, Cordeilla, Tonwenna, Ronwen, and Guenuara. These poems provide us with two sets of characters: noble, like Cordeilla and Tonwenna; ignoble, like Ronwen and Guenuara. The same is true of men, among whom we may also distinguish noble types, like King Dunwallo, Elidurus, and Lucius, and their opposites (in a minority, to be sure), like Allectus and Vortegirn. Beverus thus has praise and sympathy for the noble, condemnation for the ignoble. All this, it seems to me, gives us a picture of the impressions which Geoffrey's *Historia* made upon Beverus while he was compiling it, as well as of his personal reactions and feelings. He has no use for treachery and injustice, but for real achievement he has praise and admiration. He thus combines the moral with the didactic.

HUNTER COLLEGE

ON THE SOURCE OF THE DECEPTION STORY IN THE MERCHANT'S TALE

GERMAINE DEMPSTER

IT HAS often been stated that a French *fabliau* on the blind husband and the fruit tree may have been among the sources of Chaucer's *Merchant's tale*.¹ My main purpose in the present article is to show that the newly gathered analogues² lend this possibility definite support.

In collecting our versions we must guard against the danger of confusing our story with another deception story best known in the last portion of *Decameron*, Day VII, tale 9.³ Whereas Chaucer's tale is of a blind man who miraculously recovers his sight to witness his wife's misconduct, Boccaccio's hero, who sees, and was expected to see, his wife uniting with her lover, but agrees that it is only an optical illusion, is of course endowed with normal eyesight all through the tale. But because the deception scheme, both in the *Mch.t.* and in this last act in *Dec. VII, 9*, involves the climbing of a pear tree, the two have repeatedly been brought together under the ambiguous heading of pear tree story. We shall do well to avoid the phrase, calling our story that of the blind husband⁴ and the fruit tree, and the other—on which only a few words later—that of the optical illusion.

Our versions of the story of the blind husband and the fruit tree fall into two classes: In Class A, while the woman and her lover enjoy each other in the tree, the blind man is cured in consequence of the

¹ That a Russian ballad suggests it has recently been pointed out by Professor M. Schlauch, "Chaucer's *Merchant's tale*, and a Russian legend of King Solomon," *MLN* XLIX (1934), 229-32. For other references see A. Schade, "Über das Verhältnis von Pope's *January and May* und *The wife of Bath*," *Engl. stud.* XXV (1898), 26-27.

² The texts will appear in the new *Originals and analogues of the Canterbury tales* prepared by the Chaucer section of the Modern Language Association.

³ Boccaccio's story is as follows: Lidia has promised Pirro to give herself to him in the presence of her husband Nicostrato. Following her instructions and supposedly to gather fruit for her, Pirro ascends a pear tree, and then expresses his disapproval of the conduct of the couple, who, he maintains, are uniting in his very presence. Nicostrato makes him come down, and, suspecting that the tree may be enchanted, he ascends it himself. He sees the lovers together and at first upbraids and insults them, but is quickly brought back to the belief that the pear tree is responsible for ocular illusions.

⁴ We shall call the deceived man the husband, disregarding for the sake of convenience the fact that in the Portuguese version he is the woman's father.

interest spontaneously taken in the situation by two spectators, supernatural powers in all but two cases;⁶ in Class B, the noise in the tree is correctly interpreted by the blind husband; he appeals to a deity who performs the miracle without any comment. Classes A and B agree as to the dénouement, the woman succeeding in persuading the man that her purpose was to cure him of his blindness.

Leaving aside all versions derived exclusively from others well known to us,⁶ we find in Class A, besides the *Mch.t.*: (1) the *Novellino* version;⁷ (2) *Von einem Plinten*, a fifteenth-century narrative in High German verse;⁸ (3) a Low German *fabliau* found in a fifteenth-century manuscript;⁹ (4) a Great Russian ballad of unknown date;¹⁰ (5) a prose version gathered in Little Russia from nineteenth-century oral tradition;¹¹ (6) an Italian *facezia* found in a collection probably made about 1478;¹² (7) a Portuguese version picked up from oral tradition around 1880.¹³

To Class B belong: (1) the 1315 Latin verse fable of Adolphus;¹⁴ (2) a Latin prose version included by Steinhöwel in his *Aesop*, which was first published about 1476 or 1477;¹⁵ (3) a version in French prose

⁶ In the Russian versions a discussion between two human beings attracts the attention of the deity who performs the miracle.

⁶ Such are Pope's and Wieland's verse narratives, derived from the *Mch.t.*, Steinhöwel's own somewhat diluted translation of the Latin prose into German prose, and Caxton's word for word translation of Macho's French version.

⁷ The best text is in G. Biagi, *Le novelle antiche dei Codici Panciatichiano-Palatino 158 e Laurenziano-Gaddiano 193* (Firenze, 1880), p. 199. It is also found in Papanti, *Catalogo dei novellieri italiani* (Livorno, 1871), Appendix to Vol. I, p. xliii; it is reprinted from Papanti by F. Holthausen, "Die Quellen von Chaucers *Merchant's tale*," *Engl. stud.*, XLIII (1910), 168-69.

⁸ Published by A. von Keller, *Ersählungen aus altdeutschen Handschriften* ("Stutt. Lit. Ver.," XXXV, 1855), pp. 298 ff.; also in F. Holthausen, pp. 170 ff.

⁹ Published by G. W. Dasent in *Theophilus in Icelandic, Low German and other tongues* (London, 1845), pp. xxvi-xxviii, and incompletely by H. Oesterley, *Niederdeutsche Dichtung im Mittelalter* (Dresden, 1871), pp. 38-39.

¹⁰ Translated into English by Schlauch, pp. 229-32.

¹¹ A French translation appeared in *Kryptodia*, I (Heilbronn, 1883), xxviii, 65.

¹² Published by Albert Wesselski, *Die Schwänke und Schnurren des Pfarrers Arlotto* (Berlin, 1910), II, 333.

¹³ See J. L. Vasconcellos, *Giornale di filologia romanza*, IV (1883), 192-93.

¹⁴ Most accessible in H. Varnhagen, "Zu Chaucers Erzählung des Kaufmanns," *Angl.*, VII (1884), *Ans.* 160-61; also in *Originals and analogues* (1888), p. 179, and in Thomas Wright, *A selection of Latin stories* (London, 1842), pp. 174-75.

¹⁵ Reprinted by Hermann Oesterley, *Stutt. Lit. Ver.*, CXVII (1873), where our fable is on pp. 326-27. The fable is also printed in *Or. and an.*, p. 180, and by Thomas Wright, pp. 78-79. The year 1476 or 1477 is given in the *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*, Vol. I

found in Julien Macho's *Esope*, the first known edition of which is dated 1480.¹⁶

It should be stated at once that nothing indicates Chaucer's acquaintance with any version, extant or lost, belonging to Class B. We shall accordingly confine our attention to Class A, at least in the first part of our study, for Class B will later be found to give us some unexpected information on Class A.

Two facts at once raise the question whether Chaucer knew the *Novellino* narrative. It is the only A version old enough¹⁷ to have

(Leipzig, 1925), No. 351. On this date see also Oesterley, p. 3, and H. Knust, "Steinhöwel's *Aesop*," *Zeits. f. deut. Philol.*, XIX (1887), 197 and n.

In Steinhöwel's *Aesop* our fable appears (as No. 12) in the Alphonsus series (which opens the *Fabulae collectae* appendix). This is probably due to the previous association of the story with several themes from the *Disciplina clericalis* in the collection from which the Latin prose version of our story was probably derived (see Varnhagen, pp. 160-62, and, for the opposite view, Schade, p. 16), i.e., in the Latin verse fables of Adolphus. Numbers 3, 4, 5, and 6 in Adolphus correspond to *De vindemiatore*, *De gladio*, *De canicula lacrimante*, and *De puteo*, pp. 15, 16, 18, and 20, in Alfons Hilka's edition of the *Disciplina clericalis* (Heidelberg, 1911). Steinhöwel, who probably collected the material for his *Aesop* himself (Oesterley, p. 2), does not seem to have written very much, if any, of the Latin. In the translation into German prose, which we know to be his, he often likes to add little details.

¹⁶ In Macho's *Esope*, as in its model, Steinhöwel's *Aesop*, the story of the blind husband is credited to Alphonsus. This seems to have disturbed some of Macho's publishers, for the fable, present in the 1480 edition, is missing in 1484 (the *Gesamtkatalog* is mistaken in giving the contents of the two as identical; the same about the Dutch translations); it reappears in a Paris undated edition and in two Lyons editions, that of April 9, 1486 (see J. Bastin, *Les subtiles fables d'Esope* [Lyon, 1926]), and that of September 13, 1494 (the latter overlooked in the *Gesamtkatalog*), and probably in others. I compared the two texts of the undated and the 1494 editions in the Bibliothèque nationale; they differ from each other only in a few unimportant words, but constitute a decided improvement upon the 1480 text. As we are interested, in the present article, not in the history of Macho's work but in the sources behind it, we shall quote from the first edition, correcting the worst and clearest mistakes.

Macho's *Esope* was quickly translated into Dutch and English. Neither the Delft edition of 1498 nor the Antwerp 1485 edition contains our fable. The English translator and printer is William Caxton, whose collection covers the same ground as the French *Esope* except that he adds six stories at the end. His relation to Macho, though never questioned, has puzzled previous investigators. The reason is that the one known copy of the 1480 French *Esope* (Tours, Bibliothèque municipale) had escaped their attention (see Schade, pp. 16-17), and the next, 1484, not only does not include our fable, but comes too late, for Caxton tells us that the work issued on March 26, 1484, was translated from the French in 1483 (see Caxton's title-page in Joseph Jacobs, *The fables of Aesop as first printed by William Caxton in 1484* [London 1889], Vol. II). The 1480 edition not only solves these two questions, but saves us from a false impression about the translation of Caxton, who followed his text much more closely than would be suggested by the later editions of the *Esope* and should be blamed, not for originating mistakes (at least not many), but only for copying them. His faithfulness is somewhat surprising in the case of our story, as the translator had printed the *Cant. t.* in 1478, and may, at the time of the *Aesop*, have already been engaged in the careful comparison of texts which preceded the following 1484 edition of them.

¹⁷ Written down probably about 1300; see Letterio di Francia's introduction to *Le cento novelle antiche, e libro di novelle e di bel parlar gentile, detto anche novellino* (Torino, 1930).

reached him in the form that came down to us; and it has, in common with the *Mch.t.*, very much more indeed than the bare theme. Like January, the Italian husband is a rich man. It is in the course of the tale that he becomes blind, and this infirmity makes him the more jealous and suspicious; he never allows his wife to leave him. It is the lover who first becomes enamored. He cannot find an opportunity to speak to the woman, but he seems to be dying for love, and "lo, pitee renneth" in her heart. It is she who invents the pear-tree scheme and manages to give him the proper directions. In the garden, when she expresses her desire for pears, her husband's first thought is that someone else might pick them for her, but she does not mind climbing into the pear tree. Finally, to make sure that nobody will follow her, the blind man embraces the trunk of the tree. Not all these features are confined to the *Novellino* and the *Mch.t.*; the embracing of the trunk, for instance, is found in all but one version, and it is nearly always the woman who undertakes the direction of affairs. But nowhere else do I find (a) the husband presented as rich, (b) his becoming blind in the course of the tale, (c) the man explicitly said to fall in love first, (d) emphasis on the long suspense in the course of which the lover nearly dies for love, (e) the mention of pity in connection with the woman's reaction, and (f) the husband's thought of a third person who might pick the fruit for his wife. Though there is nothing in all this that Chaucer might not very well have invented, these analogies, especially if we remember how brief the Italian version is—six hundred and fifty words—seem almost too numerous to be purely accidental. They bring the *Novellino* story closer to the *Mch.t.* than is any other version known to us. Further, the Italian setting in Chaucer might well be due to his use of an Italian source.¹⁸ Finally, the likelihood of his acquaintance with our *Novellino* narrative is increased by the character of the collection, the kind of work which the poet, especially during the Canterbury period, must have been quite eager to consult. Throughout our investigations his indebtedness to it will have to be kept in mind as a rather fair probability.

¹⁸ The only other Italian version known to us, the very short *faccasia*, has, in common with the *Mch.t.*, only the barest outline of the story. Another possible explanation of the Italian setting of the *Mch.t.* is Chaucer's recollection of Boccaccio, perhaps of two of his works, *Dec.*, VII, 9 (see below) and the *Ameto* (pp. 80-108 of J. S. P. Tatlock's "Boccaccio and the plan of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales," *Angl.*, XXXVII [1913]).

Could this Italian version of our story be the only one known to Chaucer? This will appear quite unlikely after we list a number of motifs not found in the *Novellino* but common to Chaucer and either the Low German, the German, or the Great Russian version.¹⁹ As the Continental texts are rather short, the only references will be to the parallel passages in the *Mch.t.*

1. In the opening of the Low German story, the passage on the precautions of the blind husband is the best parallel any version offers to E. 2087 ff. A little farther we are reminded of May's effective "egging" (E. 2135), when the woman diplomatically serves apples, then keeps the conversation upon them, and finally suggests a trip to the orchard, to which her husband readily assents (all of this, however, compressed into eight lines in characteristic *fabliau* fashion). A much more striking analogy is found in the scene of the tree-climbing, when the blind man bends over so his wife can step on his back. As in the *Mch.t.* (E. 2344-48), the suggestion for this comes from the woman.

2. In *Von einem Plinten* emphasis is laid on the youth of the wife (cf. E. 1415 ff., 1601, 1626, 1738, 1748, etc.), and that of her lover is at least implied in the word *schuler* (as Damian's in the word *squyer*; also in E. 1912). The lover's first step is to hand the woman a letter (E. 1879-84, 1936-39); she studies it eagerly (E. 1955, 1977 ff.). The husband is said to walk holding his pretty wife by the hand (E. 2157). While the *schuler* is waiting, not in the tree but near the tree (E. 2155), the blind husband expresses his jealous concern (E. 2160-84). At that point we are told that the lovers have settled all the particulars of the plot by correspondence (E. 2215-16); they accordingly understand each other's moves (E. 2212-14), and the man knows when it is time to ascend the tree. The woman says that lacking the fruit she so violently desires might be very bad for her (E. 2329-37). When expressing her desire to climb for it, she feels the advisability of reassuring her jealous husband and suggests that he hold the trunk of the tree

¹⁹ The Italian *facezia* is left out in this connection as too condensed, and the Portuguese and Little Russian versions as having, in common with the *Mch.t.*, no significant feature not more clearly brought out in one of the others (except the old age of the blind man in the Portuguese, but this is sufficiently accounted for by the father-and-daughter relation of the characters in that version). For a much more thorough listing of analogies between versions, at least the *Mch.t.*, the *Novellino*, the *Plinten*, and the Low German tale, see Schade, pp. 21-26.

(E. 2341-43). Further, he is explicitly said to help her climb up (E. 2344-49).²⁰

3. In the Great Russian ballad a blind merchant (of course it is only the teller who is a merchant in Chaucer) owns the very beautiful garden (E. 2030-37) in which he walks with his pretty wife (E. 2049-50, 2156-58). She suggests that he hold the trunk of the fruit tree while she climbs (E. 2341-42).²¹ The two spectators who discuss the situation are a married couple, Tsar David and his Tsaritzza. Put in the woman's mouth, the prediction that the adulteress will find an excuse takes the form of a defiance (E. 2264 ff.). Solomon, the Tsaritzza's unborn son, takes part in the discussion; his sarcasm at woman, and the violent anger which this rouses in his mother, remind us of the sustained invective of Proserpine against Solomon and his misogyny in E. 2242-49, 2277-81, and 2291-2302.

Could these analogies between the *Mch.t.* and these three Continental versions be explained by direct influence either way? No evidence has ever been adduced to show that the *Cant.t.* left any trace on fifteenth-century narratives on the Continent or Russian ballads at any date. And were the *Mch.t.* an isolated example of such influence, our stories could hardly have remained characteristic representatives of their purely popular genres, which they certainly are. Nor would they be likely to agree together—all three, or even all four if we include the Little Russian story—against the *Mch.t.* on such a point as apple tree versus pear tree. The reverse—Chaucer's indebtedness to our Russian, German, and Low German versions—is just as improbable, for, even removing the objection of dates by assuming the existence of fourteenth-century versions very similar to ours, we could imagine one of them reaching Chaucer in spite of the barrier of language, but hardly all three.

Could our analogies be purely accidental? Several no doubt might

²⁰ Other analogies seem less significant. In both versions the scene is laid in a city; when the woman expresses desire for fruit the husband thinks of some way to get it (but in the *Mch.t.* he only regrets the absence of a servant, while in the *Plinten*, he strikes the branches with a stick); the deceived husband wishes the death of the lovers (but this is only an imprecation in the *Mch.t.*, while in the *Plinten* it sounds like a verdict).

²¹ Her reason for making this suggestion is not stated, but, as the blind man keeps holding the trunk after she is up, it is evident that the gesture, in the better-motivated version that must have preceded ours, was explicitly given as a jealous precaution. That the husband helps his wife to climb into the tree—one of the points noted by Professor Schlauch (p. 231) as common to the ballad and the *Mch.t.* is not necessarily implied by the text.

very well be. Our theme belongs to the wide and somewhat monotonous cycle of the women's deception stories, and independent application to it of the same already familiar features is quite likely to have occurred as it was shaped and reshaped, contracted and re-expanded. Among these features, of which I feel that none, except in combination with many others, could give any valuable clue as to the relation of the versions, I should class the beauty of the garden, the youth of the wife, the ironical touch of the husband's help when the woman climbs into the tree, the shaking of the tree and falling of fruit when the lovers are together, the first exclamation of the cured husband, his humble apologies at the end, etc. But the features listed before are not all of this more or less easily reinvented and frequently reapplied type. Taking one striking motif, or combination of motifs, out of each of our three versions, say, (a) the circumstances of the lover's climbing into the tree in the presence of the couple and as planned by correspondence, (b) the climbing of the woman, not vaguely with the help of her husband, but stepping on his back, bent at her suggestion, and (c) the point added to the two spectators' conversation by their husband-and-wife relation—shall we believe that Chaucer added *all three* of these features to his source or sources in complete independence of the Continental versions where we find them? The question, of course, is not at all whether he could have drawn as much material from his imagination (we are ready to credit him with infinitely more than that), but whether his invention of just those features—once more, in a relatively short story—does not imply too many coincidences.

No such disturbing improbability seems to be involved in the one alternative left before us, viz., that the features—or at least some of the features—noted above reached Chaucer through one or more versions lost to us. The popularity of our A form of the story, and especially the fact that it circulated in the vernaculars, makes it not only likely but almost certain that more versions existed—some written down, others probably transmitted orally—than have come down to us. And it would, of course, be absurd to think of such versions as reduced to the barest outline of the plot of Class A. Such a motif as the grasping of the tree trunk, by no means an indispensable one in our story, remained tied to it through almost all its known transformations. That another, the husband-and-wife relation of the spectators,

was not confined to the Great Russian ballad is proved by the form of the story in Little Russia.²² Every version must have had its share of such nonessential features. And certainly the probability of Chaucer's indebtedness to the *Novellino* leaves open every possibility, not only of his acquaintance with other forms of the story, but of his simultaneous use of any number of variants that might have reached him.²³

Granting that Chaucer is likely to have used at least one version which we do not possess, we find ourselves faced with innumerable different possibilities. Especially through oral transmission, our story may, like any other, have reached the poet from almost anywhere through almost any medium. But only one of these possibilities, viz., that of derivation from a French version, gains any support whatever from the facts at our disposal. While keeping in mind that others exist, we shall focus our attention on that one.

We need not insist much on the perfect agreement of the hypothesis both with Chaucer's practices and with well-established facts concerning the *fabliaux* and their dissemination. We know for certain that Chaucer used the French version of at least one other deception story, the *fabliau Le Meunier et les II Clers*, and we cannot doubt that many more reached him, both in manuscript and by word of mouth. We know equally well that a number of Low German and German *Schnurren* were derived, in part or completely, from French stories.²⁴ And, certainly, amid the large number of rhymed *fabliaux* that existed and never reached us, or of prose versions of similar stories (not necessarily written down), there might well be room for our deception tale, popular all over Western Europe during the late Middle Ages.

But what is less apparent at first sight is that our Class B versions rather definitely point to the existence, in fifteenth-century France, of at least one version lost to us, in all likelihood an A version, and very probably in French rather than Latin. As has been stated before, Class B differs from Class A in that the blind man guesses the truth and appeals to God or Jupiter, who immediately restores his eyesight. But

²² But it is the man who here foresees that the adulteress will clear herself.

²³ For precedents among Chaucer's other *fabliaux* the texts are lacking. But surely while he was transforming rather bare and probably poorly told stories into such little masterpieces as the *Miller's* and *Shipman's tales*, he must have felt as free to combine elements from different sources as he did when constructing the plots of *Troilus* and *Crisseyde* or the *Franklin's tale*.

²⁴ The ancestry of Russian ballads is too obscure to support the hypothesis of a French version of the story or to conflict with it.

it is another portion of the story that claims our attention at the present point. Whereas most A versions²⁵ tell us, in a rather circumstantial way, about the lovers' difficulties and their plotting a meeting in the pear tree, the Latin verse fable and Steinhöwel's Latin prose, i.e., two out of our three B versions, take us to the orchard scene quite abruptly. The blind man, we are told, has a beautiful wife of whom he is very jealous. In the next sentence the married couple is in the garden and the husband agrees to his wife's wish to climb the tree for fruit. She is already in the tree when we first hear about the lover who was there waiting for her. Whether this is their first meeting, and how and by whom it has thus been planned, we are not told. But let us look at our third B version, the French prose of Julien Macho, an Augustine brother at Lyons. The *Esopé* in which it is found is dated 1480,²⁶ and is unquestionably directly derived from Steinhöwel's Latin *Aesop*. Macho tells us that he translates a Latin work;²⁷ the two collections, appendixes and all, cover almost identically the same ground,²⁸ and the woodcuts of the early editions provide almost superfluous corroboration.²⁹ But, instead of a translation of Steinhöwel's abrupt beginning of our fable,³⁰ this is what we read in Julien Macho:

Le temps passé estoit ung aveugle lequel avoyt une belle femme de laquelle il estoit fort jalleux, laquelle il gardoyt qu'elle ne povoyt aller en nul lieu, car

²⁵ All except the Great Russian ballad and the very brief Italian *facesia*.

²⁶ Such is the date of the copy in the Bibliothèque municipale of Tours: "Cy finissent les subtilles fables de esope translatez de latin en francois par reuerend docteur en theologie frere iulien des augustins de lyon ... impremees a lyon par nicolas phillipide bensheim et marc reinhardi de strasbourg lan mil quatre cens et octante le xxvi iour daust." But the reparations already undergone by the woodcuts in 1480 indicate that this first known edition of Macho's *Esopé* is probably not the very first one. (See the essay by C. Dalbanne and E. Droz, *Notice sur l'illustration des fables*, published in J. Bastin, *op. cit.*, p. 168.) There would be nothing surprising in such losses, as no edition is known by more than a single copy. There is enough time for one or more editions between the first appearance of Steinhöwel's *Aesop* (ca. 1476 or 1477) and the 1480 French *Esopé*.

²⁷ See n. 26.

²⁸ Macho adds no new story to Steinhöwel's collection. His main omissions are easily explained by his impatience at the repetition of the same situation in Steinhöwel's *Fabulae collectae*, Nos. 10, 13, 14 (all three in his *Disciplina clericalis* series), and 16 (first of Poggio). In all these a woman is receiving her lover when her husband unexpectedly comes home. Of the four, Macho takes only the first. His only other omission is Steinhöwel's very last story of Sigmunda and Gwisgardus (which Oesterley, who does not print it, says is the story from the *Decameron*); it is left out by nearly all other translators of the Latin *Aesop*.

²⁹ See Bastin, pp. 159-60. Similarly, Caxton's illustrations are obviously derived from Macho's, though, judging from those reproduced in J. Jacobs' reprint, they are always altered and never for the better.

³⁰ This is the beginning of Steinhöwel's version: "Cecus erat quidam habens uxorem perpulcrum, qui cum cruciatu mentis uxoris castitatem observabat, zelotipus namque

tousjours il la tenoyt par la main. Et après qu'elle fust enamourée de auleun gentil compaignons, ilz ne scauoient trouver facon ne manière ne lieu propice pour faire leur vouloir. Toutesfoys la femme qui estoyt fort ingénieuse conseilla à son amy qu'il vint en sa maison et qu'il entrast au iardin et qu'il montast sur ung poyrier qui là estoyt, lequel le fist. Et quant ilz eurent fait leur entreprinse, la femme revint en sa maison et dist à son mary: "Mon amy, je vous prie que nous aillons esbatre en nostre iardin." De laquelle prière l'aveugle fust bien content et dist à sa femme: "Bien mamye, ie le vueil bien, allons." Et ainsi qu'ilz furent dessoubz le poyrier, elle dist à son mary: "Mon amy, ie te prie que ie monte³¹ sur ce poyrier et nous mengerons des belles poyres." "Et bien, mamye, ce dit l'aveugle, ie le vueil bien." Et ainsi que elle fust montée sur le poyrier, le ieune filz commença à secoure le poyrier d'ung costé et la femme de l'autre.

From this point Macho follows Steinhöwel very freely, though not more so than in a hundred other passages of his *Esope*. A number of nonessential details are suppressed,³² but almost everything Macho puts in clearly echoes the Latin. There is not the slightest reason to doubt that his copy of the German incunabulum was complete and intact, and lay open on his desk as he was writing our fable.

Coming back to the introduction just quoted, what is its origin? That Macho should have created it out of nothing would be quite contrary to his habits, for, though he sometimes expands Steinhöwel's Latin text,³³ at other times compresses it,³⁴ and elsewhere alters its de-

fuerat. Accidit autem quodam die, ut in orto sederent ameno prope arborem pîrum, uxor vero arborem cupienti ascendere ut pira legeret cecus assensit, ne tamen quis alter vir ipsam accederet, brachiis suis stipitem amplectitur. Erat autem arbor ramosa, in qua, priusquam uxor ceci ascenderet, iuuenis quidam se absconderat, mulleris expectans adventum." Steinhöwel's free translation into German expands this episode, using the direct discourse when the wife asks for fruit, and stating that the young man had climbed into the pear tree at the suggestion of the woman. This is not enough to establish Steinhöwel's use of another version besides the Latin prose. His acquaintance with our *Plinten*, or with a lost version, is of course possible.

³¹ *Que tu montes*, the reading in the 1480 edition only, is of course a mistake.

³² Macho omits the line on the power of Jupiter, the question "Why so fraudulent?," the statement that the woman at first was afraid, her claim that she has previously spent much money on medicine, and the final reconciliation by gifts. He replaces Mercury by Venus, and softens the *Veneris ludum perficias* into *se ie faisoit plaisir a ces ieune filz*.

³³ He frequently adds to the moral considerations at the end of a story, sometimes in an amusingly energetic way: "Et ainsi pouez veoir les maux que font les macquerelles que pleut a dieu quelle fussent toutes brulees" (*Fab. coll.*, No. 11). New motifs are introduced to bring in more life, as when the procuress of *ibid.* exacts a promise that her story about her little weeping dog must remain a secret (no parallel for this in any version of the story); or to motivate the actions more clearly, as when the tailor Nedius guesses why the steward comes to the workshop and this starts the action (Macho, *ibid.*, No. 13; in Steinhöwel, No. 11); or to add definiteness to the background, as when a Spaniard going from Egypt to Mecca fears not only deserts but the crossing of the Desert of Araby.

³⁴ The main reason why Macho often shortens Steinhöwel's stories is that they are lengthy. When a plan, already duly explained, is carried out, Macho, instead of repeating

tails³⁵—he is as free from any scruple in this respect as any translator of his century—yet it is striking that his imagination never suggests more than one little detail at a time; after two or three lines at the very most our somewhat pedestrian brother regularly comes back to his text. More than that: nobody *could* have written this introduction without a model, for, although it is not identical with any in our A versions, it belongs to their group as definitely and by as many ties as any one of them, so strikingly so that an almost perfect analogue to it could be built up out of bits of the German, Low German, Italian, and Portuguese tales.³⁶ We can very safely conclude that Macho was supplementing the version of Steinhöwel with another of which he had either the written text or the very definite and vivid recollection.

How close can we come to that lost source of Macho's story? First of all, did it belong to Class A or to Class B? The fact that Macho's introduction is not paralleled in any earlier B version known to us

the details, will pass with *et ainsi le fist* or the like. Or a description is deemed unnecessary (the garden in *Fab. coll.*, No. 6), or a not essential episode is much condensed (the opposition of the woman in *ibid.*, No. 4, when her husband wants to return the money he has found). But in many cases Macho seems not to get interested in the story—sometimes an immoral tale, sometimes a perfectly unobjectionable one—and impoverishes the narrative by omitting just the kind of picturesque details that he would take trouble to add elsewhere (*ibid.*, Nos. 11 and 13).

³⁵ Macho likes to change a pagan background into a Christian one (the three pilgrims of *ibid.*, No. 5, go, not to Mecca as in every other version, but to the Holy Sepulcher; little credit is gained as all three are deceivers and liars). But the reason for most small alterations is Macho's failure to understand his Latin text. For instance, a Milanese doctor (in Macho, fourth of the *facezie* from Poggio; in Steinhöwel, *Fab. coll.*, No. 20) cures madness by submerging his patients in a fetid pond: "... nudos ad palum ligabat eos, . . . aliquos usque ad genua, quosdam inquietenus [inguine tenus], nonnullos profundius, pro insanie modo, ac eos tamdiu aqua et inedia macerabat, quo ad viderentur sani." Macho takes *nonnullos* to mean none, and laboriously explains: "... mais il nen mectoît nuiz plus parfont que iusques a la furcelle pour doubte de quelque inconueniant ou maladie." A look at the illustration, where one patient has only his head out, might have helped Macho to read the passage. On mistranslations see also n. 40.

³⁶ "(Er) was eyn blynder man, schone junc wyf; se by den klederen dat nyche enen trede en trat [much of these opening lines is destroyed in the MS].—Avea una molto bella donna per molgie, et erane molto geloso. Tuttavia la tenea sì che no' la lasciava partire da sè.—Ich wil sie haben an guter hute. . . . Nun was ein schuler do, dem die frawe von herten holt was.—E non vedea chome le potesse favelare. . . . Il buono homo non sapea che si fare ne che si dire. Altro modo no' sapea trovare chome s'avenisse cholla donna.—Se heynt en an enen bomgharden ghan; up eyne bom dat he klumme.—E disse a questo gentile homo: 'Vattine nel giardino nostro e sali in su 'n uno pero. . . . Il buono homo inchantanente n'andò nel giardino.—Despois de elle estar en clima, veiu o pae mais a rapariga, e diz eila p'ra o pae. . . . —In ereme huse dat se sat, se sprak, 'Wolde gy an den bomgharden ghan. . . . 'Vrouwe, ghat my vore, Ik volghe yw al upme spore.' Do se in den gharden quemen —'E m'e venuto volgia di quelle pere. —Deixre i a buscar uma.—Darumb saltu mich steygen lan, auff den pawm oben hinan.' —De blinde sprak dar nycht wedder. . . . Do beghunde de bom to roghende.—E il pero si menava tutto."

speaks of course in favor of A, the more so as we have no hesitation in granting the possibility of loss of any number of versions of the popular A form (with Christ or God and St. Peter), while we feel quite differently about B, a bookish form apparently meant only for the public familiar with classical mythology and with the Latin language, and known to us in a chain of versions that is short but may very well be complete.³⁷ The text of Macho points the same way. Whereas nothing in it suggests any combination of Steinhöwel's version with another one, extant³⁸ or lost, of type B (replacing Mercury by Venus is a most natural change in this love story, and one entirely in keeping with the usual practice of our "translator"), the compliant and confident mood of the dupe (no tree-embracing) certainly suggests that such an introduction was not originally meant for that form of the tale in which the miracle occurs in consequence of the husband's right interpretation of the noise in the tree. More conclusive still, the point at which the A and B versions necessarily diverge—i.e., when the blind man notices the noise—is exactly that up to which Macho wrote in complete independence of Steinhöwel; the fact that he reverted to the Latin text just at this point is almost a proof that his other source took just there a decisively different course, i.e., belonged to Class A.³⁹

Of the many possibilities which this opens, one can be discarded without hesitation: Macho's lost version was neither the *Mch.t.* nor any derivative of it. Great masterpieces certainly do take strange, dwarfish forms in the hands of imitators, but that the rich and complex introduction to Chaucer's story of the blind husband should, even retold a hundred times, shrink back to exactly the form kept by its less fortunate relatives on the Continent is of course unthinkable.

In what language could an A version of our story have reached Macho? Few sedentary monks of his time knew any vernacular but their own, and there are definite indications that Macho was not a

³⁷ On Adolphus' fable as a probable source of Steinhöwel's Latin version see n. 15.

³⁸ Macho's acquaintance with the collection of Adolphus would explain nothing either in our story or in the other two told by both writers. (Steinhöwel took three out of the four themes common to Adolphus and the *Disciplina clericalis*—*Fab. coll.*, Nos. 13, 10, and 11, corresponding to Adolphus Nos. 3, 4, and 5. The two which Macho took over are *Fab. coll.*, Nos. 10 and 11.)

³⁹ What dictated Macho's choice between the A and B forms of the story? Perhaps he felt that a translator should not wander too far from the assigned task. Also the monk may have preferred to attribute the not very successful miracle to a classical deity rather than to the Christian God, as is the case in all A versions before Chaucer's.

linguist.⁴⁰ We can almost safely limit our choice to French and Latin. Which is more likely? Macho's style, I am afraid, will fail to give us the expected assistance at this point. His sentences in our introduction are, to be sure, a bit long, but they would be so whether derived from Latin prose or from the lightest octosyllabic *fabliau* verse, for even passages that are unquestionably Macho's own often sound like translated Latin.⁴¹ But there are three other considerations, all of which point the same way, viz., to French rather than Latin:

1. The lost source, as we have just seen, was almost certainly an A version. All preserved A versions belong decidedly to the popular genres, and are in the vernaculars.

2. In the rest of his *Esopo*, Macho is so remarkably free from any tendency to gather written versions in order to compare and combine them (as he could surely have done by supplementing the *Disciplina clericalis* with the *Gesta Romanorum* and the *Castoiment d'un père à son fils*, or by using the fables of Marie de France) that we can hardly think of him as amalgamating two Latin stories on just this one occa-

⁴⁰ Macho's knowledge of a little German would very probably have saved him from many a mistranslation of Steinhöwel's Latin, for it is almost certain that he used the Ulm edition reprinted by Oesterley and containing both the Latin and German prose versions of every tale. (The next edition of Steinhöwel's Latin *Aesop* is dated about 1450 in the *Gesamtkatalog*.) The beginning of a story from Poggio (in Steinhöwel, *Fab. coll.*, No. 20) will serve as an example: "Plures colloquebantur de supervacua cura, ne dicam stultitia eorum, qui canes et accipitres ad aucupium alunt. Tum Paulus quidam Florentinus: 'Ecce hos, inquit, risit stultus Mediolanensis.' Cum narrari fabulam posceremus: 'Fuit, inquit, olim civis Mediolani dementium atque insanorum medicus. . . .'" Steinhöwel translates: "Under andern sagen wurdent ettlich zerede der übrigen unnützen sorge und flysses, ich wil nit torhait sprechen, deren, die hund und federspil zuo dem baissen erzihen und berahtent. Do sprach ainer, Peter von Florenz genennet: 'Ain narr von Mailand spottet der selben menschen.' Do wir in batten, uns das ze sagen, sprach er: 'Es war ain burger ze Mailand, der torochtan und unbesinnten arczet. . . .'" In Macho: "Pöge le florentin dist que une foyz il estoyt en une compaignie ou on parloyt de la cure superflue de ceulx qui gouvernent les chiens et oyseaulx dont ung Mellannois nommé Paulus se print a rire et en riant requist a Pöge qu'il luy vaulsist dire une fable diceulx. Et pour l'amour de la compaignie il dist en cest maniere que iadis fust ung médecin melannoys lequell garisoit tous folz. . . ." Caxton, though he had a copy of Poggio (some of the fables which he adds to Macho are from Poggio), faithfully translated this combination of errors. Incidentally, his mistranslations of Macho's French are also occasionally glaring and absurd, e.g., in *Fab. coll.*, No. 5, "... et avoient ceulx provision de farine pour faire leur pellerinaige tellement quelle fust consumee excepte seulement de faire ung pain." "This thre felawes made so grette prouysyon of flour for to make theyr pylgremage in suche wyse that it was all chauffed and consumed excepte only for to make one loef only."

⁴¹ Notice, e.g., the awkward ablative absolute with a preposition in this passage, which is Macho's independent addition to a story of Poggio (No. 3): "Celluy ... avoyt une fille ... , laquelle il donna a mariaige a ung ienne filz ... , lequell après ses nopces faictes le mena en sa maison. ..."

sion.⁴² I even believe that the very explanation for this isolated case of long emancipation from Steinhöwel's text is that the story of the blind husband had formerly reached Macho, not as a moralizing *exemplum*, as many other stories of Steinhöwel's collection undoubtedly did, but in another attire which had secured it a better place in his memory, I mean in the livelier and more colorful form which it would almost inevitably take in a vernacular.

3. In the opening episodes—i.e., in the sections which Macho adds to Steinhöwel—his version and the Low German tale have in common the following features: (a) the emphasis is on the desire of the woman, the lover only complying; (b) she gives him the necessary directions, apparently talking to him quite freely though supposed to be narrowly guarded; (c) after this conversation she suggests to the blind man that they go to the garden; (d) the suggestion is said to be made in the house of the couple; (e) the husband is not only willing but pleased to follow; (f) when she speaks of climbing the fruit tree he assents with perfect readiness; and (g) emphasis is laid on the shaking of the tree.⁴³ Except for points b and c, which are half-paralleled in the Portuguese version,⁴⁴ the features just listed are confined to Macho and the Low German. As Low German writers of the late Middle Ages are well known to depend most frequently on French literature, the closeness

⁴² *Le castoïement d'un père à son fils* is so rich in details (at least in the Mailingen MS edited by Michael Roesle, not in that followed by Barbazan) that some inevitably remind us of those added to Steinhöwel by Macho (e.g., in *Fab. Coll.*, No. 2; in both versions the journey is a pilgrimage, and the first refusal to return the money is accompanied by a threat), but those resemblances are too few and vague to suggest more than distant reminiscences. It is significant that Macho should add just as many little details to the *facetas* of Poggio, most of which have no analogues in earlier or contemporary literature, as to the much-told and retold stories of the *Disciplina clericalis*.

⁴³ Other, but less numerous, features connect the Low-German version to the German and the two Russian ones. In all four the fruits are apples. In the Low German as in the Russian ballad, the woman starts with a conversation about apples. In the *Plinten* and the Low German she seems to fall in love first (though this is far from definite in the German), and St. Peter speaks twice. Besides we find two motifs confined to the Low German and the Latin versions: (a) the woman says that she has tried many remedies in vain (so in both Latin texts), and (b) something is said of the shape of the tree (*dryer telgen wart he un war*, and [Adolphus only], *arbor adunca fuit*). To exhaust the list of features not obviously insignificant connecting any two of these versions: *Plinten* and the Russian ballad give no explanation of the presence of the couple in the garden; the woman first gives her husband an apple or divides one with him; she remarks on the height of the tree; his holding the trunk is on her suggestion. Finally, one motif is confined to the two Latin versions and the Great Russian ballad: the woman claims to have been given instructions while asleep.

⁴⁴ Motif b—the Portuguese girl can talk freely to her lover, but she is not said to be as closely watched as her married sisters; her father is only *guardando a honra d'ella*; and c—the girl suggests walking up to a cherry tree within sight.

of the two versions strongly suggests a common ancestor in the French language.⁴⁵ And, indeed, the very unskilled and awkward Low German rhymers betrays style consciousness and rhetorical pretensions not unnatural in a foreigner in contact with fifteenth-century France.⁴⁶

Finally, it may be worth noting that the first half of Macho's story bears characters which at least fit in very satisfactorily with the hypothesis of derivation from a French popular form of the story. The introduction certainly has the familiar *fabliau* traits of rapidity, liveliness, and cheerful disregard of consistency. After the woman freely converses with her lover outside (though she is supposed to be kept rather *narwe in cage*), why does she come back to the house to fetch her husband for the pear-tree scene? As to the characters, though they are true enough to *fabliau* standards in our A versions, they are even more so in Macho. The adulteress is characterized less by passion than by cunning and perversity. No need for her to wait like her German sister for the young man to conceive of a scheme. Neither is she exactly like the Low German woman, whose inventiveness is hardly given credit because of the crude and exclusive emphasis on her aim and success. Nor does the matter-of-fact efficiency of Macho's heroine leave any room for that very thin, perhaps entirely feigned, but still distinctly *un-fabliau* touch of sentiment which takes two or three lines of the *Novellino* version. Finally, though her defense is much in the style of the others, one little clause—Macho's addition to the Steinhöwel half of his story—gives it an even better dose of the typical *fabliau* delight in perverse resourcefulness: "Car ie rends grâce aux Dieux et aux Déesses qu'ilz ont exaulcé ma prière, car désirant que tu me peusses veoir, n'ay cessé de prier ne iour ne nuyet qu'il leur pleust de toy donner clereté." Equally acceptable as a true *fabliau* dupe is the husband, always jealous and watchful except at the critical occasion, *bien content* to go to the garden, and so unsuspecting when his

⁴⁵ And so does the presence of our points *b* and *c* in the Portuguese version, though in a much weaker way: that version may very well also be derived (mainly or entirely) from the French.

⁴⁶ Notice the awkward parenthesis of l. 19, the bad rhymes of ll. 45/46 and 49/50, and the same affected repetition in the construction in ll. 23-26 and 46-48. It is not from the French *fabliau* rhymers that such mannerisms would be caught but probably from the later *rhétoriciens*. The rhymers may also have known Latin; the reference to remedies previously tried is rather likely to be derived, though not necessarily directly, from either Adolphus or Steinhöwel.

wife climbs the tree that he does not think of embracing the trunk as he does in all other versions, A or B.

As we close this section on the language of Macho's lost source, we must bear in mind that other facts, quite apart from his version—viz., the analogies between the *Mch.t.* and several popular versions—suggest the loss of links in the vernaculars rather than in Latin.

It is tempting to proceed and venture one or two guesses about the contents and qualities of French A versions of our story. The embracing of the tree, a definite and picturesque image, pleased every teller so well that, from Portugal to Russia and from the Rhineland to Italy, we find it in every version, whether A or B, with, however, the one exception of Macho's. This strongly suggests the absence of the motif in the source which he was following in the opening episodes. But why should it be absent there? And why did Macho, who of course found it in Steinhöwel, not incorporate it into his introduction? It may have been pure negligence; it may also have been reluctance at spoiling too soon that typically *fabliau* irony which must have resulted in his lost source from the consistently unsuspicious nature of the dupe.⁴⁷ Anyhow, this absence of the tree-embracing motif in his version gives us a rather agreeable impression that he preserved for us at least the first half of his lost source in pretty much the shape in which it had reached him. But the story may have taken several different forms on French soil and in the French language, especially during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and the introduction as written in Low German may very well be as close to one French variant as that of Macho to another. The same applies to the German *Plinten*, the first half of which has so much in common with Chaucer. As to the second part of our story, the hints as to the features of lost French versions are much dimmer and fewer. Macho gives us little since he mainly follows Steinhöwel; the Low German tale is, at the end, very brief and partly illegible; and there is no way of guessing where the features confined to the *Plinten* may have originated or how far they may have spread.

The main interest—and the one excuse—for all this speculation on hypothetical versions of a deception story is, of course, the hope of a

⁴⁷ He could not keep up this irony to the end of his tale, since in the second half of it the husband was to guess the truth as in Steinhöwel's version.

little new light on the question of Chaucer's debt to the sources of his *fabliaux*. Let us re-read, along with his tale, the two versions that have the best chance of being close to French versions within his reach, i.e., the Macho and Low German tales. We shall confine ourselves to features for which no other version offers more than a weak parallel.

Blind January was so jealous of beautiful May

That neither in halle, n'yn noon oother hous,
Ne in noon oother place, neverthemo,
He nolde suffre hire for to ryde or go,
But if that he had hond on hire alway;
For which ful ofte wepeth fresshe May [E. 2088-92],

and, again, she cannot say a word to Damian,

But if that Januarie moste it heere,
That hadde an hand upon hire everemo [E. 2102-03].⁴⁵

We have already found a parallel and possible source of much of this in the *Novellino*:

no' si partia da la molgie; tuttavfa la tenea si che no' la lasciava partire da ssè.

Macho's version, however, is closer to Chaucer's:

... une belle femme ... laquelle il gardoyt *qu'elle ne povoyt aller en nul lieu*, car tousjours il la *tenoyt par la main*;

and, for the enumeration of places where May cannot go alone, the Low German version, half illegible as it is, offers a parallel of more value than the vague one in Deschamps's *Miroir de mariage*.⁴⁶

..... gan to spele edder to der kerken
..... r hande se solde werken
..... ok jo by er syn.
..... vnwro de vrouwe fyn
..... se by den klederen dat
..... em nyche enen trede en trat [ll. 5-10].⁴⁶

⁴⁵ "With Mayus in his hand" (E. 2157) finds its best parallel in *Plinten*: "Der furt oben an seiner hant sein mynnigliches frewelein."

⁴⁶ Franc Vouloir wants a wife who

"... ne regarde par decoste
Mais soit tousjours près de ma costé,
Si non pour aler au moustier" (ll. 734-40).

⁴⁶ Ll. 5-10. We can without too much guessing translate these lines as follows: "Whether she was taking recreation or going to church or working with her hands, he was always near her. She was annoyed at this. He held her by her clothing so she could not take a step away from him."

It is implied all through Chaucer's tale that Damian's great superiority over January lies in his youth. The French lover, too, is a *ieune filz* and the Low German *eyn junghen*. No other A version has anything on the age of the lover, except what can be inferred from the word *schuler* in the High German.⁵¹

The French lover is being given instructions:

... la femme ... conseilla à son amy qu'il vint en sa maison et qu'il *entrast* au iardin.

Whereas the half-expected verb *allast* would have called no picture at all, *entrast* instantly makes the French reader visualize this garden as inclosed. Who knows if this verb, or perhaps some fuller expression of the idea it conveys, did not suggest as a suitable model the garden of the *Roman de la Rose*, *walled al with stoon* (E. 2029)? And who can tell if the whole key and wax episode may not have developed out of such a picture of a French garden? In the corresponding passage of the *Novellino*, *vattine nel giardino nostro*, the verb is as unsuggestive as *aller* would have been.

The French wife comes back to her husband and says, "Mon amy, je vous prie que nous aillons esbatre en nostre iardin," to which he readily assents. This is somewhat like what we imagine May's *egging* to be; in neither version is fruit or fruit-gathering mentioned before the scene in the orchard; in both the husband assents with pleasure. The woman's urging is different in the Low German (the apples provide the pretext), but the emphasis it receives lends it special interest for us. No urging or inducing to go to any garden occurs in any version except the three under consideration.⁵²

The stepping on the back of the blind man who bends over on the suggestion of his wife is a motif confined to the Low German version

⁵¹ On the youth of the wife the German version lays more emphasis than does the Low German; no other version has anything about it. One more parallel between the *Mch.*, the Low German, and Macho in these opening episodes seems too vague to be significant: E. 1998, "Ther lakketh nocht, oonly but day and place"; I. 16, "Kone gy vynden stede dar to"; and "ilz ne scavolent trouver facon ne manière ne lieu propice pour faire leur vouloir."

⁵² In the two Latin versions, the *Novellino*, the *facesia*, the Russian ballad, and the German *Plinten*, the couple is said to be in the garden, but no explanation is given. The woman's request in *Plinten* is only to go to a definite tree. In the Portuguese version the girl takes her father to a cherry tree along the road and within sight. In the version of Little Russia, *un jour elle va au jardin avec son mari*.

and the *Mch.t.* The contrast between the two gives the measure of Chaucer's power and will speak for itself:

Se sprak, "Bucket yw dar nedder."
De blynde sprak dar nyght wedder;
Se stech em up dat lyf;
Vp den bom clam dat sulue wyf [ll. 35-38].

"Ye, sire, no fors," quod she;
"But wolde ye vouche sauf, for Goddes sake,
The pyrie inwith youre armes for to take,
For wel I woot that ye mystruste me,
Thanne sholde I clymbe wel ynogh," quod she,
"So I my foot myghte sette upon youre bak."
"Certes," quod he, "theron shal be no lak,
Mighte I yow helpen with myn herte blood."
He stoupeth doun, and on his bak she stood,
And caughte hire by a twiste, and up she gooth [E. 2340-49].

Finally, the one feature which Macho added to Steinhöwel's pear-tree scene, and which we may fairly safely assume came from the same source as his introduction, is the woman's highly diplomatic confession of a certain selfish interest in her husband's cure, a most pardonable one, for does not love always involve selfishness?

... ie rends grâce aux Dieux et aux Déesses qu'ilz ont exaulcé ma prière, car désirant que tu me peusses veoir, n'ay cessé de prier ne iour ne nuyet qu'il leur pleust de toy donner clereté.

To this light suggestion of the pleasure which the loving husband would have in seeing his beautiful wife again, who could tell if we do not owe one of the most intensely dramatic passages in Chaucer's works:

But on his wyf his thoght was everemo.
Up to the tree he caste his eyen two, . . .
And up he yaf a roryng and a cry,
As dooth the mooder whan the child shal dye [E. 2359-65].

None of these analogies, apart from the stepping on the blind man's back, is convincing in itself, but even vague resemblances gain weight through their number. A comparison is called for. If we submit the Portuguese, Little Russian, and fifteenth-century Italian versions to a similar investigation—i.e., if we note only those points for which these variants present the unique or at least the best analogy to the

Mch.t.—we gather this: In the Little Russian tale the dupe is a nobleman, and in the Portuguese he is called *o velho*, the old man, a distant analogy, indeed, since he is there, not the husband, but the father of the woman. Though the three versions are rather short, this almost complete lack of special parallels to the *Mch.t.* does strengthen the impression that the points of contact between Chaucer, on one hand, and Macho or the Low German, on the other hand, are not due to mere accident. And of course nothing could be more in keeping with Chaucer's well-known practice than the kind of enrichment of his sources' material that is suggested by our parallels—I mean enrichment through development of secondary or even insignificant features found in those sources.

In closing this section we must remember the German and Great Russian versions and their analogies to the *Mch.t.* listed above. Certainly the husband-and-wife relation of the two spectators, the striking feature in the Russian tale, should be accepted as extremely likely—just as likely, I think, as the stepping on the back—to have occurred in some version which somehow reached Chaucer, whether through France or in any other way. And in such a version one cannot help suspecting at least some reference to the misogyny of Solomon. The motifs common to Chaucer's tale and the *Plinten* are less unusual and striking in character, but their number is rather impressive. And, of course, the supposition of a close relation of that version to Chaucer's, especially through common French antecedents, would involve no improbability at all.

One glance back at the *Novellino*. Accepting as highly probable Chaucer's acquaintance with at least one lost A version, do we still need that Italian source? Could not most of the features confined to the *Mch.t.* and the *Novellino* have come to Chaucer from our lost version or versions? This is, no doubt, a serious possibility. Weighing against it the importance of the parallels between the English and Italian tales, the setting of the *Mch.t.* in Lombardy, and the fact that Chaucer was by no means unlikely to gather and combine several versions of a popular story, we find, I am afraid, that the chances of his having or not having used the *Novellino* are almost exactly even.

The optical-illusion story has been left aside all through this discussion as different from our story of the blind husband and the fruit

tree.
able
the
sour
ceiv
If C
coul
time
foll
husb
a be
that
cont
low
have
prob
poin
tion
read
ficien
quai

33;
34;
353-7
(1888
pp. 35
the fa
léraire
62-64

35
naud,
that t
name
have
narrat
dia w
curren
Dram

36
Schad
origin

37
L. M
tinger

tree. Still, in two European versions of it, *Dec.*, VII, 9⁵³ and its probable source, the *Comoedia Lydiae*,⁵⁴ the enchanted object around which the plot develops is a pear tree.⁵⁵ There, as in the *Mch.t.* and its sources, we find a couple of lovers uniting in the presence of the deceived husband, either the lovers or the husband being in a pear tree. If Chaucer knew both pear-tree stories, it is hard to think that he could have rearranged the material for one of them without at some time or other recalling the other. This may be the explanation of the following analogies.⁵⁶ Both in *Dec.*, VII, 9 and in the *Comoedia* the husband is, like January, a rich nobleman, and the lover, like Damian, a beloved and trusted retainer, who, like him again, is at first afraid that the woman may betray him. And whereas May's sisters are all content to justify their conduct by their charitable intentions, she follows the optical-illusion heroines in claiming that her husband's eyes have deceived him. We must remember in this connection that rather probable echoes of the *Decameron* in the frame of the *Cant.t.* have been pointed out, mainly by Dr. R. K. Root,⁵⁷ and that the kind of recollection which would best account for those—i.e., recollection of previous reading without new reference to the text—would also be entirely sufficient to explain the analogies that we note here. As to Chaucer's acquaintance with the *Comoedia*, it would explain as much within the

⁵³ Summarized in n. 3.

⁵⁴ Published by Edelestand du Méril, *Poésies inédites du moyen-âge* (Paris, 1854), pp. 353-73. The optical illusion story starts on p. 371; it is reprinted in *Originals and analogues* (1888), pp. 183-85. The author is almost certainly Mathieu de Vendôme (see Du Méril, pp. 350-52 and Gröber's *Grundriss*, II, Abt. I, 413) who lived about a century earlier than the famous abbot of St. Denis and minister of St. Louis by the same name (see *Histoire littéraire de France*, XII, 420-28 and XX, 1-2, and, for a summary of the *Comoedia*, XXII, 62-64).

⁵⁵ In a third European version, the *fabliau*, *Du Prestre ki aveve* (Montaignon et Raynaud, *Recueil des fabliaux*, III, 54), the object is a door with a hole. Several facts suggest that there may have been more European versions with the enchanted pear tree. (a) The name Pyrrho, the lover's name in both the *Decameron* and the *Comoedia*, is more likely to have originated in a European tale presenting only the pear-tree story than in a complex narrative of which the pear-tree episode is only the last act. (b) The versifier of the *Comoedia* was a Frenchman, and he did not invent the ocular-illusion story which was already current in the Orient. (c) On the phrase *faire monter quelqu'un à l'arbre* see the writer's *Dramatic irony in Chaucer* (Stanford University Press, 1932), p. 54 n.

⁵⁶ Varnhagen (p. 163), notes some of those analogies but discards them as insignificant; Schade (pp. 29-30) considers the possibility not of direct influence but only of common origin.

⁵⁷ "Chaucer and the *Decameron*," *Engl. stud.*, XLIV (1912), 1-7. The recent study of L. Morsbach (*Chaucers "Canterbury tales" und das "Decameron"*, "Gesell. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen," N.F., Band I, No. 4 [1934]) adds nothing of any significance.

Mch.t., but nothing anywhere else, and would a priori seem infinitely less plausible than his contact with the *Decameron*.⁵⁸ One more analogy between the *Mch.t.* and Boccaccio's story must be mentioned for the sake of completeness: The Italian nobleman is old, and much emphasis is laid on the contrast between his age and the youth of his wife.⁵⁹ But January's sixty years are, I believe, much more likely to have been decided upon in connection with the opening episodes of the *Mch.t.*

To summarize and conclude: Of the preserved versions of the story of the blind husband and the fruit tree, only the *Novellino* narrative can be considered as a possible source of the *Mch.t.* Even taking Chaucer's use of it for granted, there is hardly any doubt but that the story reached him in at least one version that has not come down to us. As he is well known to have, at other times, made use of French *fabliaux*, as preserved texts strongly suggest the existence of at least one French version older than the one we possess, and as several similarities to the *Mch.t.* are found in the versions most likely to be close to lost French analogues, it seems quite probable that one antecedent of Chaucer's deception tale, not impossibly the one source of it, was our story as told in France, very possibly in the verse of the *fabliaux*.

CHICAGO

⁵⁸ As to lost versions of the optical-illusion story (see above, n. 55), it is impossible to tell whether any might have presented the features common to *Dec.*, *VII*, 9 and the *Mch.t.*

⁵⁹ The *Comœdia* only implies such a difference of age and passes lightly (pp. 364-65 and 370).

T
sive
sys
form
and
disp
fine
I
pop
of p
edg
gain
cou
mo
duc
the
S
arts
ne
form
tury
Sir
1
Delv
1910
Défer
(Parl
don,
Wash
2
progr
Mod

THE IDEA OF DECLINE IN LITERATURE AND THE FINE ARTS IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND

JOHN D. SCHEFFER

THE history of the literary quarrel which was waged in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries over the relative excellence of the ancient and the modern cultures has been extensively investigated, especially by the French.¹ In comparison but little systematic attention has been given to a question which was being formulated during the controversy between Ancients and Moderns, and which survived as a subject of critical speculation after the earlier dispute had subsided—the question of progress in literature and the fine arts.

It is a truism that the eighteenth century saw a great increase in the popularity of progressivist ideas. But although the central assumption of progressivist thought in this period—the belief that man's knowledge was continually improving both in accuracy and in extent—gained increasing currency,² speculations concerning the historical course of arts and letters were marked by a disposition to deny or to modify strongly the view that the quality of literary and artistic productions had improved in the past and would continue to improve in the future.

Such currency as the doctrine of progress in literature and the fine arts attained in the eighteenth century was largely owing to the connections which could be seen between this and other more popular forms of the theory of progress. Thus in the early decades of the century it was a belief in the progress of religion which led writers such as Sir Richard Blackmore and John Dennis to hope for an improvement

¹ E.g., H. Rigault, *Histoire de la querelle des anciens et des modernes* (Paris, 1856); J. Delvalle, *Essai sur l'histoire de l'idée de progrès jusqu'à la fin du XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1910), Book IV, chap. v; H. Gillot, *La querelle des anciens & des modernes en France de la Défense et illustration de la langue française aux Parallèles des anciens et des modernes* (Paris, 1914); J. B. Bury, *The idea of progress; an inquiry into its origin and growth* (London, 1920), chaps. iv–v; R. F. Jones, "The background of the 'Battle of the books,'" *Washington University studies*, VII (humanistic ser., 1920), 97–162.

² Some of the relevant texts are to be found in Delvalle, *Essai sur l'histoire de l'idée de progrès*, Book VII, and in Bury, *The idea of progress*, chap. xii.

[MODERN PHILOLOGY, November, 1936]

in modern poetry based upon and comparable to the improvement which Christianity represented over the religions of pagan antiquity.³ A conviction that "knowledge physical, mathematical, moral, and divine, increases," together with a belief in the unsounded potentialities of man's nature, served as the basis for Edward Young's plea for future progress in composition.⁴ John Gordon's citation in 1760 of instances of improvement in eloquence, poetry, and criticism was incidental to his endeavor to "vindicate the ways of God to men" by showing "that there has been a continual *Tendency to the better* in all human affairs."⁵ The superior copiousness and refinement of modern humor, James Beattie believed, could be attributed directly to a more extensive knowledge of men and of things which had come to later generations with the process of time.⁶ John Aikin, the most positive of the eighteenth-century exponents of the idea of progress in literature, stressed more clearly than any of his predecessors an affinity between progress in letters and progress in knowledge by admitting as progressive only those elements of literature which were manifestly a product of intellect.⁷ The ultimate basis for Sir John Hawkins' contention for progress in music⁸ was drawn "from the natural course and order of things, which is ever towards perfection, as is seen in other sciences, physics and mathematics, for instance."⁹

To understand more fully why eighteenth-century enunciations of theories of progress in aesthetic pursuits were few and qualified it is necessary to examine the currency of contrary doctrines. In the early

³ See Blackmore, prefaces to *Prince Arthur* (London, 1695), *A paraphrase on the book of Job* (London, 1700), *Alfred: An epick poem* (London, 1723), and appendix to "An essay on the nature and constitution of epick poetry," in *Essays upon several subjects* (London, 1716); Dennis, *The advancement and reformation of modern poetry* (London, 1701), *passim*. Cf. also Zachary Pearce in *Spectator*, No. 633 (December 15, 1714), for an extension of the theory to oratory.

⁴ See *Conjectures on original composition* (1759), ed. E. J. Morley (Manchester, 1918), pp. 9-33.

⁵ *A new estimate of manners and principles: being a comparison between ancient and modern times, in the three great articles of knowledge, happiness, and virtue; both with respect to mankind at large, and to this kingdom in particular*, I (Cambridge, 1760), II, 75-99.

⁶ See "An essay on laughter and ludicrous composition," in *Essays* (Edinburgh, 1776).

⁷ *Letters from a father to his son, on various topics, relative to literature and the conduct of life*, Vol. I (London, 1793), Letters III and IV, "On attachment to the ancients," and Letter V, "On the pursuit of improvement."

⁸ In general the eighteenth-century pronouncements upon the historical course of the fine arts were restricted to comparisons of ancient and modern achievements, and even those writers who recognized the superiority of modern artists in understanding of the principles of perspective, chiaroscuro, or counterpoint did not go so far as to contend for any general theory of progress in the arts.

⁹ *A general history of the science and practice of music* (new ed.; London, 1875), I, xxiv.

decades of the century speculations upon the historical course of literature and the fine arts were to a large extent dominated by that disposition of the Enlightenment which Professor Lovejoy has characterized as uniformitarian.¹⁰ And the uniformitarian temper, as Professor Lovejoy has pointed out, tended to foster a negative philosophy of history, since it was held that the immutable truths of "reason" and "nature" were equally apparent to all ages, or even more clearly apparent to early ages uncorrupted by traditions and prejudices.

In the later decades of the century the theory of progress in arts and letters met with opposition from at least two sources—from a cult of the primitive bard¹¹ and from a widely held view that decline was a necessary or probable consequence of any state of great excellence in artistic pursuits. This last doctrine was to survive to the nineteenth century and there receive the support of such critics as Jeffrey, Hazlitt, Macaulay, De Quincey, and Courthope.¹² But even in the eighteenth century the idea was given a wide dissemination by a series of writers.

For the eighteenth century the belief that any polite art which has been brought to a high degree of excellence must normally undergo a subsequent decline was, in point of time if not in point of currency, an old idea. Eighteenth-century authors could find it enunciated in the *Historiae Romanae* of Velleius Paterculus, written about A.D. 30.¹³ The observation that a particular art or profession is often cultivated more brilliantly in one epoch than in others, that a number of men of

¹⁰ "The parallel of deism and classicism," *Modern philology*, XXIX (1932), 281-99.

¹¹ See Lois Whitney, "English primitivist theories of epic origins," *Modern philology*, XXI (1924), 337-78, and the texts there cited.

¹² See Francis Jeffrey, review of Cromeck's *Reliques of Robert Burns* (*Edinburgh review*, January, 1809), in Jeffrey, *Contributions to the Edinburgh review* (2d ed.; London, 1846), II, 144-46; William Hazlitt, "Fragments on art: Why the arts are not progressive?" (*Morning chronicle*, January 11 and 15, 1814), in Hazlitt, *Complete works*, ed. P. P. Howe (London and Toronto, 1930-34), XVIII, 5-7, 7-10, reprinted with variations in the *Round table* as "Why the arts are not progressive?—a fragment," *Works*, IV, 160-64; cf. also *Works*, V, 44-46; XVI, 55-57, 212-13; XVIII, 37-51; Thomas Babington Macaulay, review of *Poetical works of John Dryden* (*Edinburgh review*, January, 1828), in Macaulay, *Critical, historical, and miscellaneous essays* (New York, 1866), I, 325-44; Thomas de Quincey, "Style" (*Blackwood's magazine*, July, September, October, 1840; February, 1841), in *Collected writings*, ed. Masson (London, 1896-97), X, 194-203; William John Courthope, *Life in poetry: law in taste: Two series of lectures delivered in Oxford, 1895-1900* (London and New York, 1901), Part II, Lecture III, "Poetical decadence"; cf. also Courthope, *The liberal movement in English literature* (London, 1885), pp. 24-28, 207-10.

¹³ This work survived to the Renaissance in a single corrupt and incomplete manuscript. The manuscript was discovered in the year 1515 by Beatus Rhenanus, who from it brought out the *editio princeps* in 1520 at Basle. Various editions followed. In the early eighteenth century there seems to have been a revival of interest in the history, for one translation, by Thomas Newcomb, appeared in London in 1721, to be followed by a second edition in 1724, and another, by J. Patterson, was offered in Edinburgh in 1722.

similar talents engage in the same pursuit and achieve success in it almost simultaneously, especially interested Velleius. "It seems surprising to me," he remarks, "that the most exalted *Genius's* of every Profession have flourished and exerted themselves within a very short Period of Time one of another."¹⁴ A small number of years only, he points out, were enriched by the tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. A single age produced the old comedy of Cratinus, Aristophanes, and Eupolis. Similarly the new comedy was brought to perfection in a very short time by Menander, Philemon, and Diphilus. The era of eminence in philosophy initiated by Socrates did not long survive the death of his successors, Plato and Aristotle. The period in which oratory flourished comprehended only the lifetime of Isocrates, his scholars, and their disciples.¹⁵ A comparable grouping of men of like talents, not only among writers and orators, but also among grammarians, painters, and sculptors, Velleius endeavors to demonstrate, may be observed among the Romans. In attempting to explain this general phenomenon he advances the following conjectures:

When I consider the Causes why the *Genius's* of this and the preceding Ages, interested themselves entirely in the Promotion of a particular Study; I meet with some Reasons for it, but such as very seldom put an End to my Enquiry. Emulation quickens our Endeavours, sometimes we are spur'd on by Envy, sometimes by a generous Opinion of the Excellence of a Work. 'Tis necessary for us with utmost Application to endeavour to be Excellent, which when we have arriv'd to, we can seldom long maintain, it being evident in Nature, when Things attain their highest Perfection, from the Moment they decay.

As we are incensed to overtake those before us, so when we despair of our Designs, and can neither outdo, nor come up to them, our Vigour languishes with our Hopes; what we cannot conquer, is no longer the End of our Pursuit. We resign the Quest we were upon, and look out for a new One. When we have forsaken that which we can't excell in, we seek for somewhat that may give greater Encouragements to our Endeavours. Thus this changeable Unsteadiness of our Endeavours, becomes the greatest Obstacle to Perfection in any Science.¹⁶

¹⁴ *The Roman history of C. Velleius Paterculus. In two books. Translated from the Oxford edition, and collated with all the former ones of note. By Thomas Newcomb, M.A. (2d ed.; London, 1724). Book I, chap. xvi.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *The Roman history of C. Velleius Paterculus, Book I, chap. xvii. The Latin text, ed. F. W. Shipley ("Loeb classical library" (London and New York, 1924)), reads as follows: "Huius ergo recedentis in suum quodque saeculum ingeniorum similitudinis con-*

It was essentially this same view of the inevitability of decline in literature and the fine arts, and, in some cases, this same doctrine of the extreme frailty of the spirit of emulation, which was to be taken up, elaborated upon, and given new circulation by various writers of the middle and later eighteenth century.¹⁷

The currency in the eighteenth century of the idea of unavoidable decline seems to have begun with David Hume's essay, "Of the rise and progress of the arts and sciences" (1742). If Hume was indebted to Velleius Paterculus for the theory of decline which he enunciated in this essay, he neglected to admit that obligation. We know, however, that he had consulted Velleius at least by 1752, since he used that author as a historical source in two of the essays of the volume of *Political discourses* published in that year.¹⁸ And the distinct resemblance of Hume's conception of decay to that of the Latin historian makes the possibility of indebtedness seem not unlikely.

"There is no subject," Hume observes, "in which we must proceed

gregantisque se et in studium par et in emolumentum causas cum saepe requiro, numquam reperio, quas esse veras confidam, sed fortasse veri similes, inter quas has maxime. Alit aemulatio ingenia, et nunc invidia, nunc admiratio imitationem accendit, natura quod summo studio petitum est, ascendit in summum difficilisque in perfecto mora est, naturaliterque quod procedere non potest, recedit. Et ut primo ad consequendos quos priores ducimus accendimur, ita ubi aut praeteriri aut aequari eos posse desperavimus, studium cum spe senescit, et quod adsequi non potest, sequi desinit et velut occupatam relinquens materiam quaerit novam, praeteritoque eo, in quo eminere non possumus, aliquid, in quo nitamur, conquirimus, sequiturque ut frequens ac mobilis transitus maximum perfecti operis impedimentum sit."

¹⁷ So far as I am aware, the only writer prior to the eighteenth century who made use of Velleius' theory of decay was Roger Ascham. Observing in his *Scholemaster* that the Latin tongue remained pure over a period of scarcely a hundred years, Ascham cited Velleius' remark that Roman eloquence rose to eminence with Cicero and his contemporaries and declined soon afterward, and went on to advance the general position that perfection in the arts must necessarily be succeeded by decay. He explained this fact, however, merely by drawing an analogy with the normal course of nature: "no perfection is durable. Encrease hath a time, & decay likewise, but all perfitt ripenesse remaineth but a momēt: as is plainly seen in fruits, plumes and cherries: but more sensibly in flowers, as Roses & such like, and yet as trowlie in all greater matters. For what naturallie, can go no hier, must naturallie yeld & stoupe againe." See *English works*, ed. W. A. Wright ("Cambridge English classics" [Cambridge, 1904]), p. 286. Velleius was quoted by Hake-will, *An apologie or declaration of the power and providence of God in the government of the world. Consisting in an examination and censure of the common error touching natures perpetuall and universall decay* (3d ed.; Oxford, 1635), Lib. I, cap. ii, sec. 5; Jonson, *Timber: or, discoveries made upon men and matter*, ed. Schelling (Boston, 1892), pp. 4, 11, 21-24; Dryden, *An essay of dramatick poesy*, in *Essays*, ed. W. P. Ker (Oxford, 1900), I, 37, 44; and was alluded to by Temple, "Upon the ancient and modern learning," in *Works* (Edinburgh, 1754), II, 174, but the passages have no relation to his view on decline.

¹⁸ I.e., "Of the balance of trade," *Essays moral, political, and literary*, ed. T. H. Green and T. H. Grose (new ed.; London, 1889), I, 342 n.; and "Of the populousness of ancient nations," *ibid.*, pp. 416, 438 n.

with more caution, than in tracing the history of the arts and sciences. . . . Those who cultivate the sciences in any state, are always few in number: The passion, which governs them, limited: Their taste and judgment delicate and easily perverted: And their application disturbed with the smallest accident." "Chance, therefore, or secret and unknown causes," he concludes, "must have a great influence on the rise and progress of all the refined arts."¹⁹ Nevertheless, he undertakes to formulate three major principles relative to the rise and progress of arts and sciences, and one principle pertaining to their decline. It is with the last that we are especially concerned.

The axiom concerning the decline of arts and sciences is very concisely stated. Hume advances it as a law "*That when the arts and sciences come to perfection in any state, from that moment they naturally, or rather necessarily decline, and seldom or never revive in that nation, where they formerly flourished.*"²⁰ The reasons advanced by Hume for the self-destructive operation of high eminence in the arts and sciences are founded upon the discouraging effects of established productions upon the endeavors of new applicants to distinction. He describes these effects as follows:

A man's genius is always, in the beginning of life, as much unknown to himself as to others; and it is only after frequent trials, attended with success, that he dares think himself equal to those undertakings, in which those, who have succeeded, have fixed the admiration of mankind. If his own nation be already possessed of many models of eloquence, he naturally compares his own juvenile exercises with these; and being sensible of the great disproportion, is discouraged from any farther attempts, and never aims at a rivalry with those authors, whom he so much admires. A noble emulation is the source of every excellence. Admiration and modesty naturally extinguish this emulation. And no one is so liable to an excess of admiration and modesty, as a truly great genius.

Next to emulation, the greatest encourager of the noble arts is praise and glory. A writer is animated with new force, when he hears the applauses of the world for his former productions; and, being roused by such a motive, he

¹⁹ "Of the rise and progress of the arts and sciences," *ibid.*, p. 176. Hume does not explain precisely in what sense he uses the term "arts and sciences." The context of his essay, however, indicates that he is speaking primarily of fine arts and letters rather than of the practical arts and sciences.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 195. For a right understanding of this passage it should be noted that the term "perfection" is apparently used, as frequently during the Enlightenment, to designate not supreme excellence, but merely high excellence. Hume elsewhere employs the word in such a relative sense; thus see the phrase "greatest perfection" in the first paragraph of the essay "Of the populousness of ancient nations."

often reaches a pitch of perfection, which is equally surprizing to himself and to his readers. But when the posts of honour are all occupied, his first attempts are but coldly received by the public; being compared to productions, which are both in themselves more excellent, and have already the advantage of an established reputation.²¹

Were the early productions of Molière and Corneille, formerly so well received, to be offered on the stage for the first time in the present age, he continues, it would discourage the young poets to see the indifference and disdain of the public. "The ignorance of the age alone could have given admission to the *Prince of TYRE*; but it is to that we owe the *Moor*: Had *Every man in his humour* been rejected, we had never seen *VOLPONE*."²²

It is perhaps not to the advantage of a nation, Hume speculates, to have the arts imported from its neighbors in too great an excellence, since this extinguishes the spirit of emulation among its youth. "So many models of ITALIAN painting brought into ENGLAND," he points out, "instead of exciting our artists, is the cause of their small progress in that noble art." A similar handicap was experienced by Rome when it received the arts from Greece. Likewise, "That multitude of polite productions in the FRENCH language, dispersed all over GERMANY and the NORTH, hinder these nations from cultivating their own language, and keep them still dependent on their neighbours for those elegant entertainments."²³ The circumstances are somewhat different, however, he specifies, when arts and sciences are transferred from ancient to modern nations. While it is true that the ancients have left us models highly worthy of admiration, these are in languages known only to the learned. Moreover, "the comparison is not so perfect or entire between modern wits, and those who lived in so remote an age." Had Waller written in Rome during the reign of Tiberius, his early works would have suffered from a comparison with the finished odes of Horace. But in modern times the fame of the English poet is not injured by the superiority of the Roman. "We esteemed ourselves sufficiently happy, that our climate and language could produce but a faint copy of so excellent an original."²⁴

"In short," Hume concludes, "the arts and sciences, like some

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 195-96.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 196.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 196-97.

plants, require a fresh soil; and however rich the land may be, and however you may recruit it by art or care, it will never, when once exhausted, produce any thing that is perfect or finished in the kind."²⁵

Whereas Hume had assumed that a high level of artistic achievement in one generation operates to discourage the endeavors of succeeding generations, James Marriott, writing in 1755, believed that the existence of just models does not so much discourage from further productions as tend to corrupt the quality of these productions. The corruption comes, Marriott conceived, through man's constant pursuit of novelty. "There is perhaps no passion," he asserts, "which more strongly marks the general character of mankind, which operates more forcibly, or actuates more universally, than the desire of NOVELTY."²⁶ Although this desire works beneficially in the early stages of a civilization, there is a certain point beyond which its operations prove detrimental:

Not only the improvements of every invention for the convenience and ease of life, but even of those which constitute its real ornament, are owing to this desire of novelty. Yet here too we may grow wanton; and nature seems to have set us bounds, which we cannot pass without running into great absurdities. For the very principle which has contributed to the perfection of the finer arts, may become the cause of their degeneracy and corruption.²⁷

This same fear of the excessive pursuit of novelty was shared by other writers, among them Joseph Warton. Warton, writing in the first volume (1756) of his *Essay on the genius and writings of Pope*, was impressed by the obvious fact that cultures had risen and declined in the past, and endeavored to give some explanation of this phenomenon, at least in so far as it concerned literary productions. "History," he remarks, "has recorded five ages of the world, in which the human mind has exerted itself in an extraordinary manner; and in which its productions in literature and the fine arts, have arrived at a perfection not equalled in other periods."²⁸ The first of these ages, he states, was that of Philip and Alexander, the second that of Ptolemy Philadelphus,

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

²⁶ *World*, No. 117 (March 27, 1755). The ascription of the essay accepted is that adopted by Alexander Chalmers in his *British essayists*, Vol. XXVI.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *An essay on the genius and writings of Pope* (5th ed., corr.; London, 1806), I, 180. This passage and those which appear below are the same, with minor variations, in the first edition.

the third that of Julius Caesar and Augustus, the fourth that of Julius II and Leo X, and the fifth that of Louis XIV, William and Mary, and Queen Anne.²⁹

The quality of literary productions in past cultures, Warton's survey of history convinces him, has normally declined when once criticism has become highly developed and the rules of writing have been fully formulated. He states it as an axiom governing the fortunes of belles-lettres that "In no polished nation, after criticism has been much studied, and the rules of writing established, has any very extraordinary work ever appeared."³⁰ "This has visibly been the case," he specifies, "in Greece, in Rome, and in France, after Aristotle, Horace, and Boileau, had written their ARTS of POETRY." In England likewise, he exclaims, although the rules of the drama have never been better understood than at present, "what UNINTERESTING, though FAULTLESS, tragedies have we lately seen!"³¹

Warton was evidently unwilling, however, to attribute decline in letters solely to the inhibiting effects of the critical spirit. While the restricting influence of established rules was, in his opinion, one possible cause of decay, he also recognized two other possible causes—one "that philosophical, that geometrical, and systematical, spirit so much in vogue," the other, and here his speculations resembled those of Marriott, a tendency toward affectation arising from an attempt to surpass just models. Beyond a statement of these three provisional explanations of decline, however, he did not attempt to carry his thought:

How to account for the fact here mentioned [the phenomenon of decay in letters], adequately and justly, would be attended with all those difficulties that await discussions relative to the productions of the human mind; and to the delicate and secret causes that influence them. Whether or no, the natural powers be not confined and debilitated by that timidity and caution which is occasioned by a rigid regard to the dictates of art; or whether that philosophical, that geometrical, and systematical, spirit so much in vogue, which has spread itself from the sciences even into polite literature, by consulting only REASON, has not diminished and destroyed SENTIMENT, and made our poets write from and to the HEAD, rather than the HEART; or whether, lastly, when just models, from which the rules have necessarily been drawn,

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 180-81.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 198.

³¹ *Ibid.*

have once appeared, succeeding writers, by vainly and ambitiously striving to surpass those just models, and to shine and surprise, do not become stiff, and forced, and affected in their thoughts and diction.³²

Both the first and the third of these tentative explanations, however, were to be advanced more confidently by later writers of the century to support theories of decline.

It was essentially the view shared by Marriott and Warton which was advanced by Alexander Gerard in his *Essay on taste* in 1759. "When poetry and eloquence are brought to perfection," Gerard remarks, "the next generation, desiring to excell their predecessors, and unable to reach their end by keeping in the road of truth and nature, are tempted to turn aside into unbeaten tracks of nicety and affectation. The novelty catches and infects the general taste."³³ The source for this position was apparently Voltaire's "Essay on taste," which was included in the volume published by Gerard.³⁴ Voltaire had developed the same thesis, though at somewhat greater length:

The taste of a nation may degenerate and become extremely depraved; and it almost always happens that the period of it's perfection is the forerunner of it's decline. Artists through the apprehension of being regarded as mere imitators, strike out into new and uncommon paths, and turn aside from the beautiful simplicity of nature, which their predecessors invariably kept in view.³⁵

In such efforts to avoid imitation, he had held, artists display a certain degree of merit; this tends to obscure the defects of their productions. The public, loving novelty, applaud these productions, but their approval is soon followed by disgust. New artists appear, make new efforts to please, and depart still farther from nature. Thus the taste of a people is corrupted. "Overwhelmed with new inventions, which succeed and efface each other with incredible rapidity, they scarcely know where they are, and cast back their eager and anxious desires towards the period, when *true taste* reigned under the empire of nature."³⁶ But that happy age cannot be recalled. Only a few choice

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 198-99.

³³ *An essay on taste . . . with three dissertations on the same subject. By Mr. de Voltaire. Mr. d' Alembert, F.R.S. Mr. de Montesquieu* (London, 1759), p. 130.

³⁴ This latter essay is a translation of Voltaire's article, "Gout (Gramm. Littérat. & Philos.)," contributed to the *Encyclopédie*, VII (1757), 761.

³⁵ Voltaire, "An essay on taste," in Gerard, *An essay on taste*, p. 220.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 220-21.

spirits continue to cultivate true taste, in their own small circle, "remote from the profane eye of the depraved and capricious multitude."³⁷

Samuel Johnson and possibly Oliver Goldsmith must also be numbered with Marriott, Warton, Gerard, and Voltaire among those who believed that the normal course of arts and letters is corrupted in its later stages by an unwarranted pursuit of novelty. "The natural progress of the works of men," Johnson held, "is from rudeness to convenience, from convenience to elegance, and from elegance to nicety."³⁸ For illustrations of this remark he turned to the history of architecture and languages. In an article in the *Weekly magazine* for January 19, 1760, an anonymous writer, perhaps Goldsmith,³⁹ observes that "every art when it has attained perfection from the natural instability of human things, necessarily declines towards its former imperfection; the desire of novelty leading us not less to add to what is already complete, than to improve what is yet unfinished."⁴⁰

Quite apart from this article, however, Goldsmith's writings reveal him as an exponent during these same years of the doctrine of decline in arts and letters. "It may be proper," he states in his *Enquiry into the present state of polite learning in Europe* (1759), "to take a slight review of the decline of ancient learning; to consider how far its depravation was owing to the impossibility of supporting continued perfection; in what respects it proceeded from voluntary corruption; and how far it was hastened on by accident."⁴¹ Such a review, he thinks, may afford instruction if it is utilized for a comparison with the course of modern learning: "We shall thus be enabled to perceive what period of antiquity the present age most resembles; whether we are making advances towards excellence, or retiring again to primeval obscurity: we shall thus be taught to acquiesce in those defects which it is impossible to prevent, and reject all faulty innovations, though offered under the specious titles of improvement."⁴²

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 221.

³⁸ *Idler*, No. 63 (June 30, 1759).

³⁹ See Arthur Friedman, in *Modern philology*, XXXII (1935), 281-99, for the hypothesis of Goldsmith's authorship of this and other articles in the *Weekly magazine*.

⁴⁰ "The modern taste in music considered," *Weekly magazine: or, gentleman and lady's polite companion*, No. 4 (January 19, 1760), p. 95.

⁴¹ *Works*, ed. Gibbs (new ed.; London, 1901-8), III, 468. The term "learning," as employed by Goldsmith in the *Enquiry*, is virtually synonymous with "letters."

⁴² *Works*, III, 468.

Judging from the foregoing statements, it would appear that Goldsmith regarded the decay of learning as in some measure avertible. This view is supported by his assertion that while learning may be on the decline in France and England, "yet it is still capable of retrieving much of its former splendour."⁴³ There are other elements, however, in Goldsmith's thought which seem to indicate that he considered decay, however long it might be deferred, as ultimately certain. Thus in Letter LXIII of the *Citizen of the world*, Lien Chi Altangi, remarking that China is imperceptibly degenerating from her former greatness, concludes:

This decay is surely from nature, and not the result of voluntary degeneracy. In a period of two or three thousand years she seems at proper intervals to produce great minds, with an effort resembling that which introduces the vicissitudes of seasons. They rise up at once, continue for an age, enlighten the world, fall like ripened corn, and mankind again gradually relapse into pristine barbarity. We little ones look around, are amazed at the decline, seek after the causes of this invisible decay, attribute to want of encouragement what really proceeds from want of power, are astonished to find every art and every science in the decline, not considering that autumn is over, and fatigued nature again begins to repose for some succeeding effort.⁴⁴

And in the *Enquiry* Goldsmith speculates upon one possible cause of decline in a passage reminiscent of Hume and Velleius Paterculus:

As learning advances, the candidates for its honours become more numerous, and the acquisition of fame more uncertain: the modest may despair of attaining it, and the opulent think it too precarious to pursue; thus the task of supporting the honour of the times may at last devolve on indigence and effrontery, while learning must partake of the contempt of its professors.⁴⁵

A more potent menace in his view are those epidemics of criticism and pedantry which, he holds, accompany high excellence in learning. Here his explanation of decline is analogous to the first explanation of Warton. Among the ancients, he observes, neither the satire and contempt of the wise nor the laws framed by the state could check the rise of a legion of critics.⁴⁶ In his discussion of the state of learning in

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 491.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 238-39.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 468. An edition of Velleius (Paris, 1754) was among the books left by Goldsmith at his death. See the catalogue issued for the sale of his library which is reprinted by James Prior in his *Life of Oliver Goldsmith, M.B.: From a variety of original sources* (London, 1837), II, 585.

⁴⁶ *Works*, III, 472.

France and England he restates the dangers of an increase in critical writings, and reiterates the difficulty of coping successfully with such an increase:

.... criticism may properly be called the natural destroyer of polite learning. We have seen that critics, or those whose only business is to write books upon other books, are always more numerous, as learning is more diffused; and experience has shown, that instead of promoting its interest, which they profess to do, they generally injure it. This decay which criticism produces may be deplored, but can scarcely be remedied, as the man who writes against the critics is obliged to add himself to the number. Other depravations in the republic of letters, such as affectation in some popular writer, leading others into vicious imitation; political struggles in the state; a depravity of morals among the people; ill-directed encouragement, or no encouragement, from the great,—these have been often found to co-operate in the decline of literature; and it has sometimes declined, as in modern Italy, without them; but an increase of criticism has always portended a decay. Of all misfortunes, therefore, in the commonwealth of letters, this of judging from rule, and not from feeling, is the most severe. At such a tribunal no work of original merit can please.⁴⁷

While this emphasis upon the fatal effects of pedantic criticism may be regarded as in some measure a special pleading of the rights of authors against too presumptuous critics, it is evident that Goldsmith's general disposition was to regard polite learning as a very delicate plant subject to various ills and vicissitudes.

The thought of Henry Home, Lord Kames, concerning the history of literature and the fine arts shows a curious blend of progressivist ideas with a skepticism of any long-continued state of great eminence. The assumption that taste reaches its maturity in any nation only by slow degrees appears frequently in his writings. Thus in *Elements of criticism* (1762) we read that "men, originally savage and brutal, acquire not rationality nor delicacy of taste till they be long disciplined in society."⁴⁸ And in *Sketches of the history of man* (1774) it is again asserted that taste improves only gradually: "The national progress of morality is slow: the national progress of taste is slower. In proportion as a nation polishes and improves in the arts of peace, taste ripens."⁴⁹

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 510.

⁴⁸ *Elements of criticism* (New York, 1838), p.471.

⁴⁹ *Sketches of the history of man: considerably enlarged by the last additions and corrections of the author* (Edinburgh, 1788), I, 200.

Naturally, any exponent of a doctrine of the decline of cultures has to admit, at least tacitly, the fact that cultures must first of all rise. But Kames seems to imply at times that taste and the arts are continually progressive, improving from culture to culture. Thus in his discussion of Homer, while admitting that this poet was perhaps the greatest genius that ever existed, still he declares that "it would fall little short of a real miracle" to find in him "such ripeness of judgment and correctness of execution, as in modern writers are the fruits of long experience and progressive improvements, during the course of many centuries."⁵⁰ Such an art as sculpture, which involves only a relatively simple imitation, may, he thinks, be brought to excellence in an early period of civilization. This art, however, is an exception.⁵¹

But while Kames's inclination is to hold that literature and at least the more complex arts of design develop only gradually toward excellence, and can hope to reach their zenith only in a relatively advanced period of civilization, it is vain, in his opinion, to expect that any form of aesthetic pursuit will continue to improve indefinitely, or will remain long in a state of great excellence, once that state has been attained. In general, it may be said, he finds such pursuits susceptible to both external and internal disturbances, especially in the later stages of their development.

One external force that has operated at times in the past to undermine letters and the fine arts is despotism. To this cause is to be attributed the downfall of the arts among the Romans.⁵² A more persistent cause of decline is luxury. Kames seems to regard the latter as a virtually inescapable obstacle, not only to long-sustained progress in all human activities, but to the prolonged existence of societies themselves. "In all times," he asserts, "luxury has been the ruin of every state where it prevailed. Nations originally are poor and virtuous. They advance to industry, commerce, and perhaps to conquest and empire. But this state is never permanent: great opulence opens a wide door to indolence, sensuality, corruption, prostitution, perdition."⁵³ Fear of the consequences of luxury leads him to celebrate a middle point between impoverished barbarism and opulent civilization as more suited for the welfare of human beings than either ex-

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 277.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 219-20.

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 292-93.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, II, 153-54.

treme. It is among such circumstances, he holds, that taste ripens best:

.... taste goes hand in hand with the moral sense in their progress toward maturity; and they ripen equally by the same sort of culture. Want, a barren soil, cramps the growth of both: sensuality, a soil too fat, corrupts both: the middle state, equally distant from dispiriting poverty and luxurious sensuality, is the soil in which both of them flourish.⁵⁴

Of internal forces which tend to undermine excellence in literature and the fine arts Kames distinguishes several. In *Elements of criticism* he asserts a general trend from simplicity to complexity in arts and letters analogous to the trend from barbarism to luxury in societies, and points to symptoms of such complexity in the productions of his own day:

A gradual progress from simplicity to complex forms and profuse ornament, seems to be the fate of all the fine arts: in that progress these arts resemble behavior, which, from original candor and simplicity, has degenerated into artificial refinements. At present, literary productions are crowded with words, epithets, figures: in music, sentiment is neglected for the luxury of harmony, and for difficult movement.

The same tendency is discovered in the progress of the fine arts among the ancients.⁵⁵

"But what taste," he asks, "is to prevail next? for fashion is a continual flux, and taste must vary with it. After rich and profuse ornaments become familiar, simplicity appears lifeless and insipid; which, would be an unsurmountable obstruction, should any person of genius and taste endeavor to restore ancient simplicity."⁵⁶

In *Sketches of the history of man*, some twelve years later, Kames is less fearful of immediate pernicious effects through an increase in ornament and complex forms of art. Nevertheless, he affirms even more fully than before the operation of causes which eventually produce decline in arts and letters quite irrespective of such external influences as despotism and luxury. Unwarranted innovation is seen as one form of menace to aesthetic pursuits as they approach a high degree of cultivation:

A useful art seldom turns retrograde, because every one has an interest to preserve it in perfection. Fine arts depend on more slender principles than those of utility; and therefore the judgment formed of them is more fluctuat-

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 197.

⁵⁵ P. 107.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

ing. The variety of form that is admitted into the fine arts by such fluctuation of judgment, excites artists to indulge their love of novelty. Restless man knows no golden mean, but will be attempting innovations without end. Such innovations do well in an art distant from perfection: but they are commonly the cause of degeneration in arts that are in perfection; for an artist ambitious to excel, aims always to be an original, and cannot submit to be an imitator.⁵⁷

Manifestly this view of the fatal effects of novelty or innovation in arts that are approaching perfection is identical with that expressed by Marriott, Warton, Gerard, Voltaire, and Johnson. Kames cites in his support, however, not these authors, but two other sources, Velleius Paterculus and Winckelmann.⁵⁸

Instances of decline caused by innovation, Kames endeavors to show, may be discovered in the history of various arts. "The Ionic," he states, "was the favourite order when architecture was in its height of glory. The Corinthian order came next; which, in attempting greater perfection, has deviated from the true simplicity of nature: and the deviation is still greater in the Composite order."⁵⁹ After the period of Augustus, literature degenerated from a like cause: "In attempting still greater perfection, the Roman compositions became a strange jumble of inconsistent parts. . . ." ⁶⁰ Similarly music, he seems to consider, has been corrupted in modern times by innovation manifested in a "slight and superficial taste for harmony above melody."⁶¹

Apart from all the influences mentioned above, however, there is, in Kames's view, "a particular cause that never fails to undermine a fine art in a country where it is brought to perfection." That is "a performance so much superior to all of the kind, as to extinguish emulation."⁶² The operation of this principle extends also to the sciences, and "is exemplified in the great Newton, who, having surpassed all the ancients, has not left to his countrymen even the faintest hope of rivalling him; and to that cause is attributed the visible decline of

⁵⁷ I, 281-82.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 282. "This is the plain meaning," he states, "of a florid passage of Velleius Paterculus (Roman history, lib. I). 'Naturaque, quod summo studio petatum est, ascendit in summum; difficultisque in perfecto mora est; naturaliterque, quod procedere non potest, recedit.' Which may pass in a learned language, but will never do in our own tongue. 'The idea,' says Winckelmann [*sic*], 'of beauty could not be made more perfect; and those arts that cannot advance farther, become retrograde, by a fatality attending all human things, that if they cannot mount, they must fall down, because stability is not a quality of any created thing.'"

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 282-83.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 283.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 289.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 299.

mathematical knowledge in Great Britain."⁶³ The same cause would have destroyed the arts of sculpture and painting among the Greeks, even though that people had remained free; it is likewise probably responsible for the decay of painting in modern Italy.⁶⁴

The decline of any art or science proceeding from this last-mentioned cause, Kames specifies, "is the most rapid where a strict comparison can be instituted between the works of different masters."⁶⁵ Because the superiority of Newton above all other mathematicians could be ascertained with precision, the science of mathematics declined rapidly in Great Britain.⁶⁶ In Italy a talent for painting was sustained for many years, since though one artist excelled in design, another in color, and another in graceful attitudes, none appeared of such superior genius as to approach perfection in every branch of the art. It was not until that period was reached when each individual excellence had been seized upon by one or another of the masters that painting began to decline. Architecture continued to be cultivated with vigor longer than painting, because "the principles of comparison in the former are less precise than in the latter."⁶⁷ When the architect found it impossible to rival his predecessors in an established mode, he turned to a new mode, which, though perhaps less elegant, was supported for a time by novelty.

Such, then, is the theory of decline enunciated by Kames. Arts, letters, and sciences, in this view, rise only gradually toward eminence. But the process of refinement which improves them leads eventually to their decay. As the general taste grows more delicate, it is also more easily perverted. Above all, as models of excellence become superior, the spirit of emulation diminishes. Decline proceeding from the latter cause is especially rapid where the nature of the art or science admits of a close comparison between different productions.

Though Adam Ferguson devoted considerable attention in his *Essay on the history of civil society* (1767) to the subject of decline and corruption in states, he was relatively little concerned with the fortunes of arts and letters. Nevertheless, it is possible to discern in his

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 299-300. In enunciating this general principle Kames again quotes from Velleius' pronouncement on decline, and provides in a footnote a translation of the portion which he uses.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 301.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

brief pronouncements upon literature a somewhat modified version of the doctrine of decline.

In the cultivation of the practical arts, Ferguson observes, man's needs, or supposed needs, provide a constant incentive to activity: "No measure of fortune, or degree of skill, is found to diminish the supposed necessities of human life; refinement and plenty foster new desires, while they furnish the means, or practise the methods, to gratify them."⁶⁸ The elegant and literary arts, likewise, Ferguson admits, "have their materials which cannot be exhausted, and proceed from desires which cannot be satiated."⁶⁹ "But the respect paid to literary merit," he adds, "is fluctuating, and matter of transient fashion." In particular, he finds, after epochs of creative activity, men tend to relax their efforts, and become content to admire and study those works which have already been produced:

When learned productions accumulate, the acquisition of knowledge occupies the time that might be bestowed on invention. . . .

After libraries are furnished, and every path of ingenuity is occupied, we are, in proportion to our admiration of what is already done, prepossessed against farther attempts. We become students and admirers, instead of rivals; and substitute the knowledge of books, instead of the inquisitive or animated spirit in which they were written.⁷⁰

That such a transition from creative rivalry to studious admiration represents a decline in Ferguson's estimation is fairly evident. "The object of mere learning," he asserts, "is attained with moderate or inferior talents, and the growing list of pretenders diminishes the lustre of the few who are eminent. When we only mean to learn what others have taught, it is probable that even our knowledge will be less than that of our masters."⁷¹

Robert Cullen, writing in the *Lounger*,⁷² No. 73 (June 24, 1786), was especially concerned with explaining the decline of sculpture since the time of the ancient Greeks. In music and painting, he considers, the moderns have excelled the achievements of Greece. In poetry he believes it must be allowed that "the Roman poets, as well as those of modern times, approach so near the Grecian models, as to suffer very

⁶⁸ *An essay on the history of civil society* (8th ed.; Philadelphia, 1819), p. 390.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 390-91.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² The ascription of the essay accepted is that adopted by Alexander Chalmers in his *British essayists*, Vol. XXXVII.

little from the comparison." "But in Sculpture," he asserts, "the Greeks stand confessedly unrivalled, as having attained the summit of perfection." Several factors, he points out, combined to foster the rapid progress of sculpture among the Greeks, and enabled that people to bring the art to a high level of excellence while other arts remained less fully developed.

But, one may ask, though sculpture was brought to perfection in Greece, have not later ages succeeded in at least equaling the early productions? Cullen does not think so. On the contrary, he finds that the art has continuously declined since antiquity. It is not difficult, he thinks, to explain this deterioration. The incentive to excel in sculpture, so his explanation runs, has been removed by the surpassing accomplishments of the Greeks. Thus, at the time of the revival of learning in Europe, artists cultivated painting, where renown was still to be gained, and neglected sculpture, where no further glory was to be attained. In advancing this position Cullen enunciates very clearly the doctrine of the inevitable decay of arts:

When any art has received a very high, or perhaps its utmost degree of perfection, this circumstance of itself necessarily destroys that noble emulation which alone can stimulate to excellence. Conscious of being unable to surpass the great models which he sees, the artist is discouraged from making attempts. The posts of honour are already occupied; superior praise and glory are not to be reached; and the ardour of the artist is checked by perceiving that he cannot exceed, and that after all his efforts he will not be able perhaps to equal the productions of those masters who have already the advantage of an established reputation.

It is for these reasons, as has been justly observed, that when the arts and sciences come to perfection in any state, they from that moment naturally and necessarily decline. . . .⁷³

The general law of decline thus stated is made even more precise by certain amplifications which Cullen advances. If this law holds true, he declares, "then surely the more perfect degree of excellence any art has attained, the more certain must be its after-decay." It is possible, he believes, to carry this train of observation somewhat farther, and

⁷³ By whom it has been justly observed Cullen does not specify. Certain of the expressions which he uses, however, it will be noticed, point directly to Hume as a source. Thus, cf. "noble emulation"; "when the posts of honour are all occupied"; "have already the advantage of an established reputation"; and especially "*when the arts and sciences come to perfection in any state, from that moment they naturally, or rather necessarily decline,*" which occur in the essay "Of the rise and progress of the arts and sciences" (see pp. 160-61 above).

affirm that "if the art has arrived at the highest degree of perfection of which it is capable in any age, or in any situation, that art will not only naturally decline amongst the people where it so flourished, but that this circumstance will prevent its ever being again brought to any considerable pitch of improvement amongst any other people, while the first perfect models remain." The last principle, however, he conceives, is the more operative in proportion as the art is more simple. He develops a distinction between poetry and sculpture in this respect, observing that "the difference of language, the infinite choice of subjects, and the variety of powers which poetry can employ, prevent the eminence of a poet in one country from having much effect in damping the efforts of the poets in another." In the case of sculpture, however, the matter is distinctly otherwise: "No diversity of subjects, no variety of powers to exert, no difference in the mode of expressing his conceptions, fall to the share of a Statuary."

In general, however, it will be recognized, Cullen added little, if anything, new to the theory which we have been tracing. His essay appears to be, essentially, an elaboration of Hume's observations upon decline. Its importance lies chiefly in the evidence which it affords of the currency of the idea of inevitable decay during the later part of the eighteenth century.

The theory that arts and letters necessarily decline after they have reached any high state of eminence was stated by Joseph Priestley two years later as a familiar doctrine requiring but little elaboration. "An historian will . . . observe," he states in his *Lectures on history, and general policy* (1788), "that when arts have arrived at a considerable degree of perfection in any place, they have generally begun from that period to decline; one reason of which may be, that when the general esteem is engaged, there is little room for emulation."⁷⁴ "The paintings of Italy," he points out in illustration of this observation, "left no room for the ambition of England. The same was nearly the case with Rome with respect to Greece; and the finished productions of the French language long prevented the German nation from attending to the cultivation of their own."⁷⁵

⁷⁴ *Lectures on history, and general policy; to which is prefixed, an Essay on the course of liberal education for civil and active life* (London, 1793), II, 214.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* The instances of decline cited by Priestley, it will be noticed, are the same as those advanced by Hume.

It is possible, Priestley conceives, to make a clear distinction between the historical course of arts and the historical course of science. "Though the *arts*, as music, painting, and poetry," he asserts, "have perceivable limits, beyond which it is almost impossible to advance, this is far from being the case with *science*, of which the human faculties cannot conceive the possibility of any bounds."⁷⁶ "The discoveries of Newton in natural philosophy," he states, "so far from discouraging other philosophers, only serve as an incentive to them in their search after new discoveries."⁷⁷ Moreover, the phenomenon of recurrent decline in arts and letters need not be greatly deplored: "And admitting that the reputation of Pope, and a few others, should check the ambition of succeeding poets, it is only after such a quantity of valuable poems have been produced, that more are hardly desirable."⁷⁸

The explanation of decline offered by Archibald Alison was a somewhat detailed restatement of the doctrine of unwarranted innovation. Artistic productions, Alison explains in his essay "On the sublimity and beauty of the material world" (1790), are in some cases beautiful from being expressive of design, that is, of the skill and taste of the artist, and in others from being expressive of character, or the interesting and affecting qualities of the subject itself.⁷⁹ In all the arts which have for their object the production of beautiful forms, he continues, it may be considered a fundamental principle that the expression of design should be subordinated to the expression of character. Unfortunately, however, these arts have been governed by the contrary principle, and character has been made subject to design. To this subversion of values, he believes, may be attributed "that decline and degeneracy which has uniformly marked the history of the fine arts, after they have arrived at a certain period of perfection."⁸⁰

To the generality of mankind the test of excellence in beautiful forms is character. To the artist, however, the test of excellence is skill, "the production of something new in point of design, or difficult

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 215.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ *Essay on beauty*, by Francis, Lord Jeffrey; and *Essays on the nature and principles of taste*. By Archibald Alison, L.L.D. (reprint of 5th ed.; London, n.d.), pp. 219-20.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 220.

in point of execution."⁸¹ When, therefore, the arts have attained that stage of their progress in which excellence can no longer be exhibited merely by the expression of character, the artist is normally led "to signalize his works by the fertility of his invention, or the dexterity of his execution; and thus gradually to forget the end of his art, in his attention to display his superiority in the art itself."⁸² While the artist is thus deviating from the true standards of composition, the public, gratified by novelty, and moved by the uncertainty of principles of judgment in the fine arts to submit to the guidance of those who are themselves practicing the arts, are also misled, and assume that what is new is likewise beautiful.

By these means [Alison recapitulates]; by the preference which artists are so naturally disposed to give to the expression of design, above the expression of character; by the nature of these arts themselves, which afford no permanent principle of judging; and by the disposition of men in general to submit their opinions to the opinions of those who have the strongest propensity and the greatest interest in their corruption, have the arts of taste, in every country, after a certain period of perfection, degenerated into the mere expressions of the skill and execution of the artist, and gradually sunk into a state of barbarity, almost as great as that from which they at first arose. "Alit aemulatio ingenia," (says Velleius Paterculus, in speaking of the same subject). . . .⁸³

After quoting Velleius at length in support of his position, Alison adds that the causes which he has distinguished extend to every one of those arts which are concerned with the production of beauty. "They who are acquainted with the history of the fine arts of antiquity," he believes, "will recollect, that the history of statuary, of painting, of music, of poetry, and of prose composition, have been alike distinguished, in their later periods, by the same gradual desertion of the end of the art, for the display of the art itself."⁸⁴

Concerning the question whether the arts of modern Europe must inevitably undergo a similar decline Alison wavers. "For an error, which so immediately arises from the nature, and from the practice of these arts themselves," he admits, "it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to find a remedy."⁸⁵ Nevertheless he alludes to certain circumstances

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 221.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 221-22.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

in the present state of Europe which may operate at least to check such decay:

... whether the beautiful models of antiquity in every art, may not serve to fix in some degree the standard of taste in these arts; whether the progress of philosophy and criticism may not tend to introduce greater stability, as well as greater delicacy of taste; and whether the general diffusion of science, by increasing in so great a proportion the number of judges, may not rescue these arts from the sole dominion of the artists, and thus establish more just and philosophical principles of decision, it is far beyond the limits of these essays to inquire.⁸⁶

The historical philosophy of arts and letters advanced by these writers is both clear and reasonably homogeneous in its major assumptions. The theory to which they subscribed is not merely the primitivistic doctrine that among any people imagination early reaches a maturity beyond which it cannot advance, and from which it must necessarily decline under the chilling influence of developing reason. It is not the idea that the history of man's culture has been characterized by vicissitude, or by alternating cycles of barbarity and refinement. It is rather the view that any aesthetic activity which has attained a high degree of excellence will normally undergo a subsequent decline. All these writers agree that literature and the fine arts, however long a course of improvement they may undergo, become susceptible in the later stages of their development to forces of decay, and that these forces tend to prove fatal to further creative efforts. It is only with reference to the way in which decay manifests itself that they show any marked divergence of opinion. Here, however, several trends of doctrine are discernible. Thus Hume attributes the phenomenon of decline wholly to the discouraging effects of seemingly unsurpassable models upon the endeavors of new candidates for fame. Marriott, on the other hand, ascribes it to the unwarranted pursuit of novelty. Warton, in turn, advances three tentative explanations of decay—the inhibiting effects of criticism and rules, the chilling operation of the scientific spirit manifesting itself in letters, and the corrupting influence of affectation arising from the attempt to excel by novelty. The third of these doctrines, closely related as it is to Marri-

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

ott's view, is restated by Gerard and Johnson, while Goldsmith tends to emphasize the first, and holds that criticism is chiefly responsible for decline in literature. Kames believes that both the corruption arising through novelty and affectation and the discouragement occasioned by pre-eminent models operate to undermine arts and letters, and in addition speculates upon various external causes of decline such as despotism and luxury. Ferguson identifies decay with a shift from creative rivalry to studious admiration. Cullen and Priestley give their support to the view previously enunciated by Hume and Kames, and find that the spirit of emulation responsible for productive activity in arts and letters flags as the established models become more difficult to surpass. The latter, it may be noticed, also draws a distinction between the limited possibilities for progress in the arts and the infinite scope for improvement in science. Alison once more associates decline with the pursuit of novelty, and declares that the arts of beauty normally degenerate in the later stages of their progress as artists turn to the expression of their own skill and invention. It was with such varied formulation and development that the idea of decline in literature and the fine arts, militating strongly against the spread of the contrary belief in the continuous progress of arts and letters, descended to the nineteenth century.

AUGUSTANA COLLEGE
SIOUX FALLS, S.D.

WILLIAM HUGGINS AND TOBIAS SMOLLETT

L. F. POWELL

FATE has been unkind to William Huggins. He made no perceptible mark during his life, and after his death was almost completely forgotten. He is, perhaps, only remembered today as a minor character of Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, in which he figures as one of the victims of Johnson's caustic wit: "It appears to me, that Huggins has ball without powder, and Warton powder without ball."¹ This neglect is hard on a scholar who produced, with the help of others, a complete version of *Orlando furioso*, was the first Englishman to translate the *Divine comedy*, and was competent to cross swords with Tom Warton, the historian of English poetry.

Huggins' translation of Ariosto was published anonymously in 1755, with a dedication to George II signed by Temple Henry Croker, to whom the work was in consequence ascribed, not only in the translator's time, but in our own.² Of his translation of Dante only a single passage of twenty-one lines (*Purgatorio*, XI, 1-21) has been published.³ In Huggins' will, dated May 26, 1761, is the following clause:

I give to my Worthy Friend the Rev^d Mr Thomas Monkhouse,⁴ Fellow of Queens College Oxon the Sum of Fifty pounds on Condition and with full

¹ *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill, revised by L. F. Powell (Oxford, 1934), IV, 7. For the details of Huggins' life, see the *DNB* (rev. ed.). He married Anne, daughter of William Tilson, of the Dower House, Hampton Court.

² I have dealt with this translation fully in *Boswell's Life of Johnson* (1934), IV, 473-75. See also Roderick Marshall's *Italy in English literature* (New York, 1934), a valuable work to which my attention has been drawn by my friend, Mr. J. L. Clifford.

³ *British magazine*, I (1760), 266. The translator's name is not given. Smollett, who was interested in the magazine and whose *Sir Lancelot Greaves* was published in the same volume, may have been responsible for its inclusion. See Paget Toynbee, *Dante studies* (1921), p. 288, where the passage is reprinted. The translation was presumably of the whole *Comedy*: the names of the three parts are given on the engraving which Huggins intended to prefix to the edition (see n. 5, below).

⁴ Monkhouse matriculated from Queen's College, Oxford, March 24, 1743, aged seven-teen; he took the degrees of B.A. in 1748, M.A. in 1751, B.D. in 1768, and D.D. in 1780; he became a Fellow of the college in 1759 and Vicar of Sherborne Monachorum, Hants., in 1780; he was for a few years Principal of St. Edmund Hall. See Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses* (1888), III, 969, Nichols, *Literary anecdotes*, IX, 490, and Magrath, *The Queen's College*, II, 317. He died April 15, 1793 (*Gentleman's magazine*, LXIII, 1, 479, 496; XCVIII, ii, 570). He edited the third and largest volume of the Clarendon State Papers, a work which occupied him for ten or eleven years; this was published in 1786 and is still of value to the students of English history.

persuasion that he will, to the best of his Abilities, Superintend an Edition of the Dante, and Annotations, with all Matters thereto belonging, lately translated and compil'd by me, and also a New publication of the Ariosto, in manner and form as he shall Judge best, the Expences of the Printing and publication, and all charges relative thereto to be paid by my Executors herein after named and all advantage arising therefrom to be for their Joint Benefit.⁵

Nothing happened: the reasons for the failure of the persons concerned to carry out Huggins' wishes are not known; perhaps they were financial; at any rate, their joint inaction deprived Huggins of the distinction of being the first Englishman to publish a translation of the *Divine comedy*.⁶ The manuscript is lost.

Huggins' answer to Warton's *Observations on the Faerie Queene of Spenser* (1754), entitled *The Observer observed*, was published in 1756. This pamphlet has been attributed to Huggins, but the evidence has never been conclusive. Such evidence is now provided by Huggins' own copy⁷ of the book to which he was replying; the following are characteristic strictures. Warton in his *Errata* corrects seven errors and adds: "The rest are such as cannot mislead the reader," on which Huggins comments:

After endeavouring to mislead thy Reader Thee mightest have added to those Errata or rathr lump'd them a little better, by confessing, you knew not how to Correct the Press for the Italian. What dirt thee hast cast on the renowned writer in that Language, I have obiter remark'd, being awaken'd to attention by my Resentm^t the rest of thy Galimatias had no such Power over me. A scribbler, who has Malice for his Mover & Ignorance for his Conductor, must expect Contempt for his Reward.

This passage, slightly revised, appears in *The Observer observed* (p. 21), where it opens with "More frank than true"; "Thou" is substituted

⁵ The Rev. James Granger in 1772 begged Dr. Ducarel's "acceptance of the Print of Mr. Huggins, from a private Plate, and never sold in the shops." He adds: "It is after a Painting by Hogarth. Huggins, who did a good Translation of Dante, had it engraved, to prefix to that Work, which was never printed." See Nichols, *Illustrations*, III, 601. The engraving is by T. Major (F. O'Donoghue, *Catalogue of engraved British portraits in the British Museum* [1910], II, 581). The painting is in the possession of Miss Janet Blunt, who also owns a painting, by Hogarth, of Huggins père. It is reproduced by Roderick Marshall in his *Italy in English literature* (1934).

⁶ The Rev. Henry Boyd's version, the first English translation to be published, appeared in 1802. See Paget Toynbee, *Dante studies* (1921), p. 289. His translation of the *Inferno* appeared in 1785. Hayley's version of the first three cantos of the *Inferno*, the earliest published English translation of any considerable part of the *Divine comedy*, appeared in 1782. *Ibid.*, p. 159.

⁷ This is now owned by Professor R. S. Crane, who has courteously permitted me to make use of it. See *Boaswell's Life* (1934), I, xiii, n. 1, and IV, 476.

for "Thee," "in some part" for "obiter," and "just indignation" for "Resentm^t." On Warton's erroneous statement (p. 3) that the superiority of *Orlando furioso* over the *Gerusalemme liberata* was "at length establish'd by a formal decree of the Academicians della Crusca, who held a solemn court of enquiry concerning the merit of both poems," Huggins exclaims: "Consummate coxcomb. Knows not what he is talking of"; his printed version is (p. 11): "Good Heav'ns! a *formal decree*—what insolence! a *solemn Court*—what ignorance!" Warton never troubled to correct the error. Huggins let himself go at the end of Section i (p. 11), where Warton enlarges on the confusion and irregularity of *Orlando furioso*; he fills the margin with a string of exclamations and remarks: "Falsly urged. And what then! False criticism. Really? So! Dismal! Get penny Puppy. Too low & too Melancholy a story to go on with. O! Insupportable! Nasty Pedant, with his Trite Unity. Lyar. Ignorant Schoolboy. False in fact. Counter to Ariosto's design: done by those, whose earnestness to embellish him, was as impertinent, tho: not so bad as thine to deface. They meant, tho: needless, to clear up. Thou to misguide." In the printed version (p. 17) this is welded into a coherent criticism:

He fills the remainder of this section with false criticism, sarcasm, abuse, too insignificant, too insupportable. . . . Indeed he writes like an ignorant school boy; his observation is as absurd as false in fact. Counter to Ariosto's design and apparent meaning, such marginal stuff was done by those, whose earnestness to embellish him was as impertinent, tho' not so base, as thine to injure: they meant, tho' needless, to clear up; thou to misguide.

There can no longer be any doubt about the authorship of *The Observer observed*. One marginal comment, not reproduced in the pamphlet, on Warton's note that he was "obliged to the admirable author of the Rambler" for the observation that Italian "deals largely in identical cadences" (p. 82) is of interest:

Confession of a Novice, Condescension of a Puff.—But this m^t help sell a book, full of Trumpery to make it saleable. Howev^r this incense, rath^r index, of ignorance is well offer'd by one to the other, neith^r at that time knowing the Italian Language: Johnson m^t tell him such trite stuff; but, the very first Idea, as ending ever with Vowels, shows it. The very Tenses in th^r Terminations to one who Peeps into a Grammar. Blockhead!

This does not exhaust William Huggins' literary activity. He composed and published an oratorio,⁸ wrote a tragedy which was neither published nor acted,⁹ and may have translated the sonnets of Zappi.¹⁰

Little is known of Huggins' private life; but I am now able, thanks to the documents which have been courteously placed at my disposal by Miss Janet Blunt, of Adderbury Manor, Banbury, to throw some light on this and to show that he enjoyed the close friendship of one of the greatest of English novelists, Tobias Smollett. The earliest of these documents is the following amusing and highly characteristic letter to the Reverend Richard Warneford.¹¹ The letter is not holograph, but a careful copy made by Huggins' son-in-law, Thomas Gatehouse.¹²

MY DEAR OLD FRIEND.

My Son has frequently pleased me with your kind remembrances and as I will not, cannot doubt the Sincerity of them—will be as Frankly as imperti-

⁸ *Judith: an oratorio; or, sacred drama. By W—— H——, Esq.: The Musick composed by Mr. William de Fesch* (London, 1733). This is ascribed in the catalogue of the British Museum to William Higgins. A copy to be perfect should have a frontispiece inscribed "W. Hogarth Inv."

⁹ *Polydore*; see below.

¹⁰ The authorship of the translation of Zappi's sonnets, published in 1755, is uncertain. The title is: *Sonetti. Di Giovanne Battista Felice Zappi. Scelti et Tradutti dallo Traduttore dell' Ariosto . . . Londra. Appresso ill Editore, nella strada detta Rupert-Street*. T. H. Croker presented a copy to Magdalen College, Oxford, and in a letter to the President claimed it as his (see *Boswell's Life* [1934], IV, 474); he also sent a copy (now in the Dyce Collection at the Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington) to Lady Hester Pitt with a manuscript dedication, of which the opening paragraph is: "Madam, Fearful of my offending, had I presum'd to make that Goodness publick, which I am so deeply indebted to; I, much against my Will, forbore inscribing these Sonnets to Your Ladyship in Print; but could not with-hold my Pen from giving this private Testimony of my Gratitude." Croker, however, appears to have had the habit, but not the knack, of "writing dedications," so that this unprinted example has even less value as evidence of authorship than that to *Orlando furioso*. Croker lived in Rupert Street. His translation of *The satires of Ariosto* was not published till 1759; so that cannot be the translation mentioned in the above title. A plague on all anonymous authors!

¹¹ He was a native of Freshford, Somerset, and a chorister of Magdalen College School, Oxford, 1710-16, matriculating at the college on July 5, 1715; he took his first degree in 1719 and proceeded M.A. in 1721; he became Vicar of St. Martin's, Coney Street, York, and Sellick, and Subchanter of York Minster. He died November 29, 1755, of an apoplectic fit, the very day on which he told Gatehouse that the matter in dispute between them, the lease of Nether Wallop Old Rectory, was settled. His *Sermons* were published in two volumes at York in 1757; among the subscribers were W. Huggins (four sets), T. Gatehouse, and Bennet Langton. Dr. Samuel Wilson Warneford, the great philanthropist, was his grandson. See Bloxam, *Magdalen College register*, I, 135; II, 87; and Foster, *Alumni Ozonienses* (1888), IV, 1501.

¹² See below, n. 30. He leased the Old Rectory of Nether Wallop from the Vicars Choral of York Minster, the "body" mentioned in the letter. The house was pulled down in 1838 by the last impropriator, the Rev. Walter Blunt, who replaced it by the present "Wallop House" (teste the Rev. F. W. Hyne Davy).

nently personal in my reply to y^r Aggregate courtesy. Thank Heaven in the greatest measure from its bounty & partly from my own discreet retirem^t from the detestable Capital for the term of almost 30 Yrs. on a Salubrious Spot¹³ w^{ch} I have from Filth and Beggary render'd Neat, Rich, may I say Noble. I have enjoy'd a continued Series of perfect health—Nor know I—tho: for some Years dignify'd in 2 Several Quarters a Grandfather any sort of Decay either in Body or Mind.—To make this appear a little probable many of my Friends erst Associates at Dear Mag: Coll: whom I must esteem, as much above flattery as I w^d endeavour to be unsusceptible of it—have have [sic] but a few weeks past insisted that I now look better etc.—then when you remember me the Flashy Beau at place prædict—& Quoad my mind—far be it vain glory! w^{ch} wish will in some sort seem Sincere by my Name's not being thereto annexed I have compleated the most consummate, Laborious and prodigious Task, perhaps ever exhibited in the Poetic world—I am sensible when applying to so exquisite a Scholar as y^r self I am going to utter a piece of litterative Blasphemy—the Book is larger than Homer's Illiad & Oddysey conjointly, But as much Superior to him and Virgil as a diamond to a Pebble—Not all the Lucre or hon^r thence acquired has afforded me the smallest degree of Satisfaction when compared to that I felt in sending my Mite of Gratitude to my much honour'd College¹⁴—It wou'd seem odd shou'd I not name my Hero—'Tis a littoral Translation of the Orlando Furioso of Ariosto—And shou'd your Northern Clime not be aversed to the Muses—As it stands Italian and English, Stanza ag^t Stanza, you may assert meo periculo any body if they have a Smatch of Latin a fortiori with a little french—may become Compleat Masters of y^e Italian thereby and bless the delights they must receive from their charming Instructor. But whither has my Extravagant Pen run away wth me—I am got among Clouds and Starrs—when my Commission is relative to Lands and Tenements—Dull Subject—after so many years enthusiasm conversing with Heroes and y^e Gods—But in Sober Seriousness Mundane affairs are not to be neglected—Nevertheless my Open Soul abhors reserve and to Act like myself I must violate and Over-rule my Sons, tho: honest and discreet injunction—therefore to avoid repeated Repetition chuse to inclose his L^re—I have frequently attended to his right and undeniable reasons on this Subject, I have oft read your judicious and well contrived Argum^{ts} è contra—the whole manet altà mente repostum¹⁵ and as I wou'd Scorn judicially to Suffer my Veracity to be warp'd by Favour or Affection—So stand I now no less upon Punctillio—when I averr your Body are too hard—he seems to offer the full Value, all Considerations being weigh'd—Mistake me not my Dear S^r in thinking that I obtrude my Opinion upon

¹³ Headley Park, Hampshire, which Huggins had inherited from his father.

¹⁴ The letter in which Huggins offered his translation to the President was originally dated January 1, 1755, but was not sent till the following April; see *Boswell's Life of Johnson* (1934), IV, 474.

¹⁵ *Aeneid* i. 26.

you—with any Expectance, that it sh^d have any more Weight wth you & y^r Body—than I have power over it—but pardon a necessary (thô frank) declaration—I well know my Son when he has deliberately consider'd Matters is Obstinate, I wou'd Scarce use that Epithet when is the right thereto annexed—Ye best know for my delicacy forbids the Context to—Oblatum respuat Aurum¹⁶—Excuse Merriment—we used to laugh together—Nevertheless when that brilliant Mineral is in the Scale Father, Brother, Friend, are feathers all, and up the Beam must fly and break the head of him who Counter Casts himself into the Balance—So I intermeddle not—You well know the thoughts of your

Affectionate and Obed^t Serv^t W. H.

P. S. Is there any way of my becoming a Negotiator if so Command me—My Letters to be left at the Post-house—Farnham—Surry.¹⁷

When precisely Huggins made the acquaintance of Smollett is not known, but toward the end of 1756 he sent him a copy of his translation of *Orlando furioso* and received in return Smollett's version of *Don Quixote*; Smollett's letter accompanying the gift is dated December 7, 1756.¹⁸ Early in the following year Huggins, assuming the rôle of the author's friend, sought Smollett's critical opinion of his tragedy, *Polydore*, which has suffered the same fate as his translation of Dante. Here it is:

DEAR SIR

The Pleasure I received in reading your Friend's Performance was equal to the Honour you have done me in submitting it to my Perusal. The Characters are in my opinion artfully contrasted and well sustained: The Fable is interesting and the Diction spirited: but indeed that stream must needs flow delicious which takes its origin from the Fountain of Ariosto. Why was old Scotia robbed of the Honour of the scene? Not but that I think the names are altered for the Better. Areodante, Genevra, & Polenessa are not such tragical appellations as Polydore, Isabella and Alphonso. I think

¹⁶ "Quis nisi mentis inops oblatum respuat [v.l. respuat] aurum?" (Gautier de Châtillon, *Alexandreis*, lib. iv, ver. 570). See Bensly in *Notes & queries*, 11th ser., VI, 227, and *A banquet of jests & merry tales* (1640; repr. 1872), p. 114.

¹⁷ The letter is not dated, but it contained a Bank Post Bill, for £30, dated January 11, 1755, and bore the endorsement in Gatehouse's hand "W^m Huggins Esqr. to Mr. R^d Warneford, with my L^{fe}—inclos'd—w^{ch} I sent my Father. May 26 1755." Warneford's reply is dated May 31.

¹⁸ Mr. Claude Jones has published the letter in *Modern language notes*, L (1935), 243. It can now be definitely stated that it was written to Huggins and not to Croker. Mrs. Smollett, writing from Leghorn, May 28, 1773, to Archibald Hamilton, her husband's publisher, says: "I retain Ariosto, as it is part in Italian and of no consequence." See R. Chambers, *Traditions of Edinburgh* (1825), I, 275 n. The original of Mrs. Smollett's letter is in the National Library of Scotland. Chambers "edited" it, and made a number of errors in the process.

the Catastrophe would have a fine effect upon the English stage, but I could wish to have seen a tender Scene between Isabella & Polydore, which I imagine would interest the Audience still more in their behalf; & the better prepare it for the excessive Grief manifested by Isabella at the supposed Death of her Lover. Are not the two successive soliloquies by Isabella and Villario towards the end of the third act, too long? Will not the Audience observe that the Deception at the Balcony is a stratagem practised in the Play of *Much ado about Nothing*? How comes Villario into the Forrest in the Beginning of the fourth Act? In this act there are three long soliloquies; two by Alphonso & one by Argio [?], which I could wish to see curtailed. There are likewise some Expressions which I think might be altered for the better, in different scenes of the Performance. These are all the Animadversions I shall presume to make upon a Piece replete with Merit—if you desire that I should put it into the Hands of Mr Garrick, I will immediately comply with your Request, though I apprehend it is altogether impracticable to exhibit it this Season, which is already almost exhausted—besides, my Interest with Mr. Garrick is so very low, that I believe it would be much better received from any other Hand than mine.¹⁹ I congratulate you upon the Proficiency you have made in the Spanish. I have read part of your Translation of Ariosto with equal Pleasure & Surprise, and am with inviolable Esteem

Dear Sir

Your most obliged humble Serv^t

T^s SMOLLETT

Chelsea. Feby 19th 1757²⁰

The letter next in date is of a very different character and of much greater importance. Smollett writes:

DEAR SIR

I think myself very much obliged to any Person who will take the Trouble to point out any Errors or Mistakes I may have committed in writing the History of England. I can safely say I had no other view in the Execution of that work, than historical Truth which I have displayed on all occasions, to the best of my Knowledge without Fear or affection. I have kept myself independent of all Connexions which might have affected the Candour of my Intention. I have flattered no Individual: I have cultivated no Party. I

¹⁹ Smollett's comedy *The reprisal* was produced at Drury Lane on January 22, but apparently the breach between Smollett and Garrick was not completely healed till later in the year. See T. Davies, *Memoirs of Garrick* (1808), I, 316–22, Genest, *Some account of the English stage* (1832), IV, 479, and H. S. Buck, *A study in Smollett* (1925), p. 93.

²⁰ The letter is holograph. On the back of it Huggins wrote a draft reply, "Humble Remonstrances—submitted to my candid & judicious Remarker," in which he asked, *inter alia*, "Is it needful to introduce either the too common distresses in Amours or the flat worn out Subject of making Love?" admitted that "Doubtless, Reason or rather what an Audience will approve, must be the Standard," and promised that "all expressions shall be chang'd implicitly to so nice & yet so kind Judge!"

look upon the Historian who espouses a Faction, who strains Incidents or willfully suppresses any Circumstance of Importance that may tend to the Information of the Reader, as the worst of Prostitutes—I pique myself upon being the only Historian of this Country, who has had Honesty, Temper and Courage enough to be wholly impartial & disinterested. I may be allowed to speak so far in my own Commendation, considering how I have been treated in public and private, by Envy, Malice and Ingratitude. When I said impartial, I ought to have excepted the Infirmities of human Nature in which I own myself involved. I have such a natural Horrour of Cruelty, that I cannot without uncommon Warmth, relate any Instance of Inhumanity. What I have said of Bambridge, I learned from the Journals of the House of Commons, in which I found such a Detail of Cruelties exercised upon Sir W^m Rich, Jacob Mendes Solas, Capt John Mackpheadris, Robert Castell, & Capt David Sinclair, as excited the strongest Emotions of Horrour, Pity, and Indignation. Now, my good Sir, I always thought that in recounting matters of Fact, an Historian could not have Recourse to better Authority than the Journals of the House of Commons, which are indeed, public Records authenticated by the Sanction of the Legislature. What private Motives might have influenced the Committee in giving their Report, I know not, and [substituted for but erased] shall be glad of any Information on the Subject: But, I can hardly think the Proto-corrupter as you are pleased to call him, had any Connexion with the Committee, the Chairman of which, was then at Variance with the Ministry. I congratulate you on your having finished the Translation of Ariosto,²¹ and am with perfect Esteem,

Dear Sir,

Your affect: humble Serv^t

T^s SMOLLETT

Chelsea July 2^d 1758²²

Huggins, whose father was deeply involved, had, there can be no doubt, impugned the accuracy of Smollett's account of the proceedings and revelations of the famous Parliamentary Committee of Enquiry into the State of the Gaols, established in 1729.²³ This account is worth quoting:

Mr. Oglethorpe having been informed of shocking cruelties and oppressions exercised by gaolers upon their prisoners, moved for an examination into these practices, and was chosen chairman of a committee appointed to enquire into the state of the gaols of the kingdom. They began with the Fleet-prison,

²¹ Huggins published a new translation of certain cantos of *Orlando furioso* in 1759 under the title *Part of Orlando furioso*. The preface is dated June 23, 1758. See Boswell's *Life of Johnson* (1934), IV, 475.

²² The letter is holograph. As it consists of a half-sheet only, I cannot say whether it passed through the post.

²³ See Amos A. Ettinger, *James Oglethorpe* (1936), pp. 89 ff.

which they visited in a body: there they found Sir William Rich, baronet, loaded with irons, by order of Bambridge the warden, to whom he had given some slight cause of offence. They made a discovery of many inhuman barbarities which had been committed by that ruffian, and detected the most iniquitous scenes of fraud, villany, and extortion. When the report was made by the committee, the house unanimously resolved, that Thomas Bambridge, acting warden of the Fleet, had wilfully permitted several debtors to escape; had been guilty of the most notorious breaches of trust, great extortions, and the highest crimes and misdemeanours in the execution of his office; that he had arbitrarily and unlawfully loaded with irons, put into dungeons, and destroyed prisoners for debt, under his charge, treating them in the most barbarous and cruel manner, in high violation and contempt of the laws of the kingdom. A resolution of the same nature passed against John Huggins, esquire, who had been warden of the Fleet-prison.²⁴ The house presented an address to the king, desiring he would direct his attorney-general forthwith, to prosecute these persons and their accomplices, who were committed prisoners to Newgate. A bill was brought in, disabling Bambridge to execute the office of warden: another for the better regulating the prison of the Fleet; and for more effectual preventing and punishing arbitrary and illegal practices of the warden of the said prison.²⁵

This narrative must have made hard reading to John Huggins' son; it is, however, a true statement of the facts as they were known at the time. Smollett in his letter to Huggins says that he learned these facts from the Journals of the House of Commons. He did. He not only followed the Journals; he copied them.²⁶ The account remained

²⁴ John Huggins, "growing in Years, and willing to retire from Business, and his Son not caring to take upon him so troublesome an Office," disposed of the freehold to Thomas Bambridge and Dougal Cuthbert for £5,000, the same sum that had been given for it, in 1728 (*Journals of the House of Commons*, XXI, 374). He died in 1745, aged ninety.

²⁵ Smollett, *History of England* (1st ed., 1758), IV, 527-28.

²⁶ See *Journals of the House of Commons*, XXI, 237, 247, 282. The passage recording the iniquities of Bambridge, "That Thomas Bambridge . . . kingdom," is taken bodily from the Report of the Committee, *ibid.*, p. 282. The "Detail of cruelties exercised upon" the unfortunate prisoners mentioned in Smollett's letter will be found on pp. 247, 277-79. The use by Smollett of these Journals is highly interesting. They were not published in the ordinary sense of that term, but printed "for the use of Members of the House." There was, however, as Mr. A. E. A. W. Smyth, the Librarian of the House of Commons, states, "nothing to prevent Members from parting with their copies . . . to friends or constituents; and it may have been possible, as it certainly was in the case of other documents, to obtain additional copies under a Speaker's order." See the valuable *Report from Select Committee on Publications and Debates' Reports* (1915), pp. 74 ff. ("Reports from Committees," 1914-16, Vol. IV). The work of printing the Journals for the period 1547-1741, occupying twenty-three volumes, was completed in 1759. The volumes are not dated: we now know that Volume XXI was available in 1757, when Smollett was writing the fourth volume of his *History*. See L. M. Knapp in the *Library*, XVI (1935), 296. The printer was Richardson—"a printer in whose skill and integrity I can confide," says Nicholas Hardinge, the Clerk to the House of Commons and the editor of the *Journals* (*op. cit. supra*, p. 76).

unaltered in all editions of the *History* published during Smollett's lifetime; but in the edition, published in 1790, "with the author's last corrections," the following note was added (II, 480): "It afterwards appeared that some of the members of this inquest were actuated by other motives than those they professed; and the Committee was suffered to sink into oblivion." This note is due, perhaps, to Huggins' representations. Smollett prided himself upon his impartiality.²⁷ This incident caused no breach between the two friends, as the following draft of a letter by Huggins shows:²⁸

Tho: prohibited Ink & Paper, tho: even interdicted thinking, the latter urges me so powerfully to be interested among the Numerous Gratulations on my Dr Friend's Restoration to his dear Liberty that I am as unable to forbear y^e Former, as I am to find terms adequate to y^e Occasion, or to Sensation thereon.

Brevity is best, where all utterance w^d be faint to Express my most ardent wishes that this finds my Inestimable Friend at his own Fire-side surrounded with his enraptured Family in perfect Sanity Cheerfulness (so long a stranger) and felicity.

Should you my Dear Sr think a shift of the Scene (not unusual experiment) conducive to Spirits or otherwise salubrious, we have a whole House, with all our own Serv^{ts}—an Excellent Cook and an entire apartment in an Open Airy Spot free to my Dearest Friend—the Acceptance of w^{ch} w^d give the extremest pleasure (can he be suppos'd, as Circumstanced, Susceptible of Such) to his dejected tho: most obliged and most

Affet. F^d & Serv^t
Whilst

W H.

Chapel Row
Queen Square
Bath
Feb^y 21. 1761.

²⁷ See Smollett's "Plan" published with the first volume of his *History* (1757), and his letter to Dr. John Moore, January 2, 1758 (*Letters*, ed. Noyes, pp. 50-51). There is not a grain of truth in Timperley's assertion that before Smollett began to publish his work he wrote to Lord Shelburne offering to "accommodate his politics to the wishes of ministers" (*Encyclopædia of literary and typographical anecdote* [1842], p. 703). Professor L. B. Namier cautiously suggests that it is to this Committee that Lord Hardwicke refers when he speaks of the "Gaol-Committee who, from being appointed and united to enquire into the abuses of gaols, became banded together for factious purposes, and were a flying squadron upon most questions during the remainder of that Parliament." See L. B. Namier, *England in the age of the American Revolution* (1930), p. 217.

²⁸ The draft is written on the back of an old letter, addressed "To William Huggins Esq. ~~near Epsom Surrey~~ in Wood Street Bath," franked "Free Robt. Hildyard," and postmarked February 12 and 16. It is not holograph, but in the hand of Thomas Gatehouse, who has indorsed it "Feb^y 21st, 1761. W—— H—— Esq^r to Dr. Smollett on his Enlargem^t from y^e K——gs Bench."

Smollett, who had recently been released from the King's Bench, where he had been imprisoned for defaming Admiral Sir Charles Knowles, replied without loss of time:²⁹

MY DEAR & MUCH RESPECTED FRIEND—

I have not been so deeply affected these many years, as I was when I received your last kind Favour—believe me, Sir, my Heart swells, & even my Eyes overflow, with Tenderness, when I now review the Contents—I flattered myself with the Hope of being able to present myself at your gate, unexpected, and Surprise you with my personal Congratulation on your Recovery—I hope to do it still—at present, Headly Park has no charms for me—I should miss my kind Landlord & be miserable—You say nothing of your Health yet I have been informed it is on the mending hand—pray, desire Mr Gatehouse or any Friend to give me some Description of your Case; & tell me whether the water agrees with you—if not, to what purpose stay at Bath?—I am perplexed and uneasy, & have no Joy in Liberty, while my good Friend is disordered or dejected—were I not tied down to the stake by periodical Publications, I would pay my respects to you in Somersetshire—Who is your Physician? What Regimen do you observe? forgive my want of Connexion—receive my Sincere Thanks for your generous Invitation; and believe me to be with invariable Esteem & warmest affection

My dear Sir,

Your very humble Serv^t

T^s SMOLLETT

Chelsea

Feb'y 25. 1761

I offer my best Respects to Mr^s Gatehouse, not forgetting our kind Landlord of Wallop, whose Generosity made the Bells of Chelsea ring at my Deliverance.³⁰

Four more letters of Smollett, all of which are new, complete the series; the first two are written to Huggins himself, the last two to his son-in-law, Thomas Gatehouse.³¹

²⁹ The letter is holograph, and is addressed "To/ W^m Huggins Esqr/ at his House in Chapel Row/ Queen Square/ Bath/ Somersetshire." It bears the stamp "Penny Post" and the postmark February 26. The seal, of black wax, is intact.

³⁰ Huggins' eldest daughter, Anna Maria, married Thomas Gatehouse in 1747 and died on December 18, 1793, aged sixty-nine. They lived at Nether Wallop, Hampshire (see above, n. 12). Gatehouse is stated to have been knighted in 1762 (*Gentleman's magazine* [1816], LXXXVI, i, 321) and died in 1799. Smollett is said by the anonymous historian of Guildford to have drawn his character under the name of Sir Thomas Bulford in *Humphry Clinker* (Bramble's letter of September 30 and Melford's letter of October 3). The portrait is not flattering, and I doubt the identification. There is a tablet to the memory of Lady Gatehouse and her sister, Maria Anna, in the chancel of St. Mary's Church, Guildford. See *The history of Guildford* (1801), p. 70.

³¹ They are all holograph; the first three are half-sheets only. They show no sign of having passed through the post.

DEAR SIR—

I presume I need not expatiate on the Pleasure I felt at receiving your last Favour, in which I have it under your own hand that you are now on the Recovery. For God's sake comport yourself with that Delicacy of Regard, that punctual attention to the Directions of your Physician, which may exempt you from all Hazard of Relapse. My Satisfaction is still mingled with a tender apprehension which will not be totally removed, untill your Health shall be perfectly reestablished—When I receive that agreeable Intimation, I will endeavour to steal from my Engagements a short Visit to my worthy Friends. Meanwhile I commit you to the Direction of your Doctor, the Care and Tenderness of M^{rs} Gatehouse, the Prayers and Wishes of all who have the Happiness of your Acquaintance & Friendship, among whom I take pleasure in numbering

Dear Sir

Your very affectionate humble serv^t

T^s SMOLLETT

Chelsea

May 8 1761

My best Respects are offered to M^{rs} & M^r Gatehouse & all my good friends at Wallop.³²

The next letter, the last Smollett wrote to his friend, tells us that his recovery was but short-lived.

MY DEAR SIR

Hamilton³³ tells me he left you in good spirits, though very weak and much emaciated, and even inclined to change your Physician; a step which I know you will not take precipitately—if you have a favourable opinion of another, let the two Doctors consult together, and Heaven grant a Blessing to their Prescription. I long extremely to see you, and would fain make an excursion sometime next week to Wallop, if I could break away from my slavish Engagements. Meanwhile, I beg to hear in what manner you proceed with respect to the Recovery of your Health, which, I hope, I need not say, is an affecting Consideration to

Dear Sir,

Your very affectionate humble Serv^t

T^s SMOLLETT

Chelsea May 25 1761

My best respects to M^r & M^{rs} Gatehouse & all friends at Wallop.³⁴

³² Whither Huggins had evidently removed.

³³ Perhaps Archibald Hamilton, the publisher of the *Critical review* of which Smollett was the editor and subsequent owner (see *Modern language notes*, XLII [1927], 232).

³⁴ On the following day Huggins made his will. It was witnessed by Richard Wainhouse, Vicar of Nether Wallop, Richard Cotton, and Henry Dench.

Huggins being now desperately ill, Smollett wrote to his son-in-law.

MY DEAR SQUIRE

Hamilton at his return from Wallop gave me such a discouraging account of my worthy Friend, that I changed my Resolution of going into Hampshire, because I could not have bore the shock of seeing him in such a hopeless Situation—I can safely say that I never was more affected by the Loss of the nearest Relation, than I should be upon losing Mr Huggins whom I have ever loved with the most cordial affection. I sincerely pity Mrs Gatehouse whose tender Heart must be deeply impressed by the prospect of losing such an indulgent and amiable Parent; It will therefore be incumbent on you, my dear Squire, to redouble your attention and Tenderness, in your Endeavours to alleviate her Loss. But, I know there is no occasion to remind you of that Duty. I beg leave to present my best respects to her, and to be remembered to all my friends at Wallop, not forgetting Monk³⁵ if he is still with you—Excuse Haste and believe me to be with inviolable Sincerity, Dear Sir,

Your affectionate humble Serv^t

T^s SMOLLETT

Chelsea June 9 1761.

The interval between this letter and the next is short; but it is evident that in it Smollett had found time to pay a visit to Nether Wallop in order to take last leave of his friend, for whom, if words have any meaning, he cherished the sincerest affection.

DEAR SIR—

I take this first opportunity of inquiring once more concerning the Condition of my good friend Mr Huggins, & of offering him the best wishes that my Heart can form. I must also make some apology for having left you so abruptly that I did not pay my Respects to Mrs Gatehouse who is so worthy of all Respect, Honour and affection. The truth is, I was in such Confusion that I hardly knew what I did; and in consideration of the Cause of that Confusion I know she will excuse my involuntary neglect—at Farnham I was so ill of the Asthma, that I really began to think seriously of Suffocation: but I am now considerably mended. I saw our friend Monkhouse, and reconnoitred Viner's House at aldershot, which will not do for my Purpose. finally I arrived without accident at Chelsea where I found my Family in good Health, tho' our old Gentlewoman had such a scouring in my absence, that my wife thought she could not have lived till my Return: but she is now perfectly recovered & I am content. Whatever might have happened, you know I must have acquiesced in the Dispensations of Providence. I present my Comp^{ts} & best wishes to Mrs Gatehouse, Miss Huggins,³⁶ my dear miss

³⁵ No doubt the Rev. Thomas Monkhouse; see above, n. 4.

³⁶ Maria Anna, Huggins' youngest daughter; she died unmarried on January 28, 1783, aged fifty-five. See above, n. 30.

Gatehouse³⁷ & good Mrs Erskine,³⁸ to Dr Musgrave³⁹ whose acquaintance I should be proud to cultivate, to my worthy friend Hill,⁴⁰ & to Mr Cotton whose distemper is, I hope, by this time abated. Let me be also remembered to Masters Sawney & Billy,⁴¹ and believe me to be with all Sincerity of affection

My dear Squire,

Your most obed^t Serv^t

T^s SMOLLETT

Chelsea June 14. 1761

Huggins survived till the third of July.⁴²

OXFORD

³⁷ Anna Maria, elder daughter and second child of Sir Thomas Gatehouse, born April 10, 1748, died December 3, 1829. She married Walter Blunt in 1774, as his second wife. It is through this marriage that the family has been continued till this day. See *Burke's Peerage and Baronetage* (1934), p. 310, col. 2 foot. See also n. 41 below.

³⁸ The Hon. Mrs. Annabella Erskine. Huggins left her an annuity of £30.

³⁹ Dr. James Musgrave, who married Huggins' second daughter, Jane. He matriculated from St. John's College, Oxford, June 27, 1727, took his B.C.L. in 1734, and D.C.L. in 1738. Huggins, on the death of his younger brother, Charles, in 1750, presented him with the rectory of Chinnor, Oxon., which he retained till his death on November 7, 1780. He and his wife inherited Huggins' Chinnor estate. He died in the Rules of the King's Bench, where he had been a prisoner for ten years. John Huggins, the Warden of the Fleet, bought Newton's library and presented it to his son Charles, on whose death Musgrave bought it. See Foster, *Alumni Oxon.* (1888), III, 101, *Gentleman's magazine* (1780), L, 543, and Villamil, *Newton, the man* (1931), p. 4.

⁴⁰ The Rev. Edward Hill. The present Vicar of Nether Wallop, the Rev. F. W. Hyne Davy, tells me that Mr. Hill was inducted vicar April 16, 1762, and had been curate for a number of years. He died in May, 1784. "I beg my esteemed Fr^d the Rev^d Mr. Hill's acceptance of Twenty Guineas & a Ring for his Care in my Illness & last Moments" and "On farther Considerations & transactions I bequeath to the Rev^d Mr. Hill Twenty Guineas more" are codicils to Huggins' will.

⁴¹ Gatehouse's two sons. "I give to my Grandaughter Anna M: Gatehouse my Repeating Watch. But the Fine Seal thereto annexed, of Homer engrav'd by Christian (as more fit for a Scholastic) I give to my Grandson Alexander together with the next best of my gold Watches. And another Gold Watch, or two if there so be, to make up towards buying a gold Watch for my Grandson William Gatehouse. And to the same purpose, my Gold Snuff Box with the Fine Picture to my Grandson Jemmy Musgrave, together with the little Box of the Series of the Twelve Caesars, as trivial tokens of my Remembrance—while my Poor thoughts will thus wander on those Objects I soon must quit" is another quaintly-pathetic codicil, dated May 28. Alexander matriculated at Queen's College, Oxford, May 19, 1768, aged seventeen, and took Holy Orders; he was dead in 1799 when his father made his will. William, born in 1752, went into the Navy, and died in 1811.

⁴² This is the date given by the epitaph inscribed on a mural tablet in Headley church; this epitaph begins "H. S. E.," but the Rev. Michael Ridley, the late Rector, failed to find any record of Huggins' burial in the burial registers. I suggest, therefore, that he was buried at Nether Wallop, where he undoubtedly died; the register of Nether Wallop for this date is lost.

Huggins does not make in his will any special mention of his books, many of which remained at Headley Park till they were sold to "J. Russell, Bookseller, at the Bible, in Guildford, Surrey," who issued "A Catalogue of a large Collection of Books, including the Valuable Libraries of Sir Thomas Gatehouse, William Huggins, Esq., of Headly Park, Hants. Deceased; Mr. Nathaniel Hammond, Late Accountant General of the Bank; and of a Clergyman." There were over 5,000 books in this catalogue, which is undated, but was probably issued ca. 1780. There are no Italian books in the catalogue.

FONDEMENTS D'UNE CHRONOLOGIE PROUSTIENNE

ROBERT VIGNERON

BIEN des études biographiques et critiques ont été consacrées à Marcel Proust; mais, à notre connaissance, aucun effort n'a été tenté pour lui appliquer les méthodes de l'histoire littéraire, en liant l'interprétation de son œuvre à un récit rigoureusement documenté des vicissitudes de sa vie intime et des phases de son activité intellectuelle. Peut-être d'ailleurs une telle entreprise eût-elle jusqu'à ces derniers temps été prématurée, car les sources biographiques manquaient: les témoignages d'amis et d'admirateurs étaient anecdotiques et peu sûrs, parfois confus, souvent partiiaux, presque toujours égotistes. Mais, depuis quelques années, la publication des premiers volumes de la *Correspondance générale* et celle de plusieurs autres séries de lettres, ont apporté une masse considérable de matériaux authentiques; malheureusement, ces textes révélateurs restaient pour la plupart inutilisables pour une étude historique: soit négligence, soit précaution, Proust avait d'ordinaire omis de dater ses lettres, et, à quelques exceptions près, les éditeurs avaient dû se contenter de les ranger dans un ordre aussi approximatif qu'arbitraire.

Cependant, dès la publication des premiers recueils épistolaires, l'abondance des allusions que nous y avons relevées à des événements politiques, artistiques ou littéraires, nous avait montré qu'il était possible de dater la plupart des lettres en se fondant uniquement sur l'évidence interne. C'est la tâche que nous avons poursuivie depuis plusieurs années, parallèlement à nos efforts pour rétablir la chronologie d'une tranche de la correspondance de Stendhal, et en employant la même méthode.¹ A mesure que les volumes de la correspondance se succédaient, notre besogne devenait d'ailleurs plus facile: en prenant d'abord comme repères les lettres dont la date pouvait être irréfutablement restituée, en ordonnant ensuite dans les périodes ainsi délimitées les lettres dont la date ne pouvait être fixée qu'avec

¹ Cf. notre «Chronologie stendhalienne», *Modern philology*, August, 1930, pp. 104-6; et nos «Problèmes de chronologie stendhalienne», *Revue d'histoire littéraire*, avril-juin 1934, pp. 231-49.

moins de précision ou de certitude, mais dont la succession apparaissait néanmoins, nous voyions les recoupements se multiplier, les hypothèses se corroborer, et la plupart des pièces du *puzzle* s'encastrent nécessairement à leur place. Ainsi se trouvaient posés les premiers fondements d'une édition critique de la correspondance, indispensable point d'appui de toute étude *historique* de la vie et de l'œuvre proustiennes.

Mais nous visions d'abord un but plus proche: le problème de la genèse et de l'élaboration de *Swann* nous tentait depuis longtemps. La chronologie de la correspondance une fois rétablie, les grandes lignes de l'histoire de l'œuvre se dégageaient, les causes et les effets s'enchaînaient, des rapports apparaissaient entre l'homme, et l'époque, et le roman. D'autres documents seront mis au jour: nous nous efforcerons à mesure de les intégrer à notre mosaïque; entre temps, il ne nous paraît pas inutile de faire connaître—sans prétendre les donner pour complets ou définitifs—les premiers résultats de notre enquête. Nous publierons donc bientôt ici-même, sous le titre de «Genèse de *Swann*», une étude historique de la conception et de l'élaboration de *A la recherche du temps perdu* jusqu'à la publication de *Du côté de chez Swann* en 1913 et au tirage interrompu de *Le côté des Guermantes* en 1914.² Nous publierons en même temps par ailleurs, sous le titre de «Problèmes de chronologie proustienne», les principales démonstrations sur lesquelles nous fondons notre chronologie de la correspondance.³ Nous nous réservons de reprendre par la suite l'ensemble de ces démonstrations, augmentées de notes critiques, dans les *Fondements d'une édition critique de la Correspondance de Marcel Proust*, que nous publierons dans un avenir prochain.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

² Cette étude, que ses proportions nous ont empêché de lire, comme nous l'avions projeté, à la réunion de la M.L.A. en décembre 1935, a fait l'objet d'une communication lue le 15 avril 1936 à la Philological Society et le 13 juillet 1936 au Romance Club de l'Université de Chicago.

³ Un de nos élèves, que nous avons initié à notre méthode et à qui nous avons communiqué une partie de nos matériaux, s'étant permis d'employer à notre insu cette méthode pour dater, pour le compte de Mme Gérard Mante, les lettres à Mme Straus qui constitueront le tome VI de la *Correspondance générale*, nous revendiquons ici formellement une méthode qui nous est propre, que nous avons élaborée pour l'étude de la correspondance de Stendhal et que nous avons depuis longtemps et le premier appliquée à celle de la correspondance de Proust.

BOOK REVIEWS

Literary criticism in antiquity. By J. W. H. ATKINS. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1934. 2 vols.

One of the characteristics of recent literary studies, on which Professor Atkins remarks, is a growing interest in ancient works of literary criticism. His restatement of the views concerning literature current in ancient Greece and Rome is addressed, doubtless in view of this increasing interest, not to classical specialists, but to the larger body of readers interested primarily in critical activities of more modern times. As addressed to that audience, his two volumes possess unusual merits: he has conformed to his statement of purpose by assembling a carefully meticulous collection of literary judgments and criteria covering the period from the earliest fragmentary statements of Greek writers to those contained in the works of men who wrote at the end of the first century after Christ; he has gone for his materials not only to writers who deal expressly in literary criticism, but to philosophers, rhetoricians, grammarians, and the practitioners themselves of the arts in question; he reports on the scholarly literature and sets forth the state of scholarly opinion on questions of date and authenticity of writings; he is careful to remark on the literary, social, and political conditions contemporary with critical writings and to speculate on the possible influence of social and intellectual conditions as shown in the writings of poets and critics; and finally, he traces the evolution of critical doctrines continuously so that he is unusually successful in showing the effect of Greek on Latin thought and the transmutation of Greek ideas during the period of the Roman Republic and early Empire. For the large audience which he addresses, who presumably will wish to fill a lacuna in their knowledge, Professor Atkins has provided an excellent statement of what they would find in Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Callimachus, Cicero, Horace, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the Senecas, Tacitus, Demetrius, Longinus, Quintilian, Plutarch, Lucian. The reader may proceed with the assurance afforded by the author's method: he may be sure that the sources and secondary materials have been examined carefully, that reference will be made to statements even in unlikely portions of a writer's works and that minor figures and fragments will be reported and related to the narrative; he will find the references accurate and the style clear.

It is perhaps a consequence of the plan of the book and its merits that the Hellenistic and Roman period is treated more successfully than the Hellenic, and that in the case of writers concerning whom our information is fragmentary or whose statements about art and literature are without systematic

expansion the reader will come from Professor Atkins' book with a more nearly adequate idea of the doctrine than in the case of writers whose approach to literature is philosophical. In a book whose virtues are expository, Neoptolemus of Parium and Dio Chrysostom may be restated with full justice whereas Plato and Aristotle may suffer. Thus the method of quoting from the dialogues of Plato results in the construction of a system of thought in which Professor Atkins is correct in finding much that is puzzling and contradictory. This mystery is somewhat attenuated by reference to the character of the time in which Plato worked and the literature he considered, to the pioneer nature of his work and sometimes even to the varying subject matter of his dialogues. Typical of this manner of treatment is the conscientious examination of the problem involved in Plato's criticism of the poets (I, 46-51). After setting forth a variety of explanations that have been offered and showing their inadequacies, Professor Atkins presents his own solution: Plato's argument was a piece of special pleading; he was presenting a brief for the plaintiff, philosophy, without considering for the time being the rightful claims of the defendant, poetry; he was correct in attacking poetry as the main avenue to truth, but not in his wholesale proscription of epic and dramatic poetry; his so-called attack on poetry is of secondary interest to the constructive side of his work (I, 66). Similarly in the exposition of Aristotle, the system of citation permits Professor Atkins to ignore the order which Aristotle himself followed in the development of the *Poetics* and on any given subject to quote indifferently from any of his works. He occasionally remarks, as when he states that according to Aristotle the function of poetry is "the giving of a certain refined pleasure" (I, 80), that the doctrine is not to be found in the *Poetics*. The view which results is consequently one of atomized doctrines, joined together when need be by Professor Atkins' historical or critical reasons, since the reasons of the original writer are frequently omitted.

Professor Atkins shows a suspicion of any systematic treatment of critical criteria, which appears particularly as strictures against fixed principles and a priori reasons, and he shows a corresponding enthusiasm for writers who remark on the relativity of critical standards to ages and tastes. Yet he is equally insistent on a permanent character in literature and he is on the alert for recognitions and hints of it in the writers he surveys. Taken in isolation from the analyses and arguments which support them, these insights are dulled to truisms: that art is a blend of representation and expression; that the ends of art are attained by a balance of free creation and control; that its appeal is neither to an individual nor to an age but to something elemental and universal in man (II, 354 and *passim*). In virtue of this doctrinal atomism it is surprising how much the writers of the six hundred years have in common, notwithstanding the relativity of criticism to its age: not only is Aristotle close to Plato, but in the later ages of grammarians and rhetoricians the statements made in agreement with or in development of earlier doctrines emerge more strongly than the doctrinal differences which were consequent on ap-

proaching literature from a philosophic, a grammatical, or a rhetorical point of view. Yet it should be remembered that such analytical weaknesses as the book displays are not inconsistent with the expository accuracy which the author set as his aim. He has written a survey of ancient literary criticism which is thorough, precise, clearly written and intelligently organized.

RICHARD McKEON

University of Chicago

The tradition of Boethius: a study of his importance in medieval culture. By HOWARD ROLLIN PATCH. New York: Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. viii+200.

The tradition of Boethius which Professor Patch traces is that of the author of the *Consolation of philosophy*. The Boethius who as author of the theological treatises contributed richly to the terminology and "sentences" of the Middle Ages, the Boethius who as translator and author of logical treatises was quoted with Aristotle and Porphyry through centuries of logical inquiry and debate and whose commentaries, themselves glossed, guided an almost endless series of commentaries, the Boethius who as author of the *De arithmetica* and the *De musica* contributed to the fundamental texts on which the growing medieval interest in the quadrivium was based, all appear in more abbreviated form and usually in statements derived from secondary sources. Even in such brief statement there is much that might be questioned. Studies of the medieval discussion of the universal have in recent years brought out a complexity which resists the simple realist, nominalist, conceptualist generalizations of earlier scholars. Scholars have likewise abandoned the aged myth that the Middle Ages was set debating the problem of the universal by a sentence in Porphyry, but Professor Patch repeats it without question (pp. 35 and 41); yet significantly when he wishes to call Boethius a realist, he quotes not Boethius' commentaries on Porphyry but one of his theological treatises. Or again to say that Boethius' conception of Fortune "may justly be regarded as a personification of Aristotle's 'incidental cause'" would be extremely difficult to illustrate by texts from Aristotle. Professor Patch, on the other hand, remarks in his preface that it is impossible at the present time to draw a rounded and balanced estimate of the influence of Boethius in medieval Europe, and he wisely devotes the greater part of his book, chapters iii and iv, to a history of the translations of the *Consolation* and of the imitations and the influence of that work. Even limited in that fashion, the field is vast. The earlier translations are described in some detail, and occasional samples are offered in citation; the later translations are necessarily treated somewhat summarily, and after the consideration of Jean de Meun the history is limited to translations into English. The influence of Boethius is traced primarily in terms of the *satura* form of his work, the alternation of passages of prose and verse, in terms of the personification of

philosophy or some surrogate for philosophy who retains her traits or vestments, who appears with personified handmaidens and engages in exhortation or debate, in the theme of consolation, the conception of fortune, or the circumstance of composition in prison. Professor Patch has undertaken an enormous subject, in the performance of which it would be easy to note the omission of some trait of Boethius or some aspect of his tradition; but such criticism would neglect the great value of his book in bringing together compendiously so many aspects of a manysided figure. The notes and bibliography are excellent for the literary tradition of the author of the *Consolation*.

RICHARD McKEON

University of Chicago

Alliterative poetry in Middle English: a survey of the traditions. By J. P. OAKDEN. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1935. Pp. x+403.

This volume supplements Dr. Oakden's earlier survey of the language and meter of Middle English alliterative poetry. Part I (110 pp.) treats the "poems as literature," with the purpose of showing a continuity of tradition from Old English to Middle English alliterative poetry. Dr. Oakden emphasizes the fact that the subject matter and general treatment of the earliest pieces derive from well-known Anglo-Saxon types of poetry, and, largely by the use of quotations from a recent study by Professor Wyld, he makes the same point concerning *Lazamon*. Then in a chapter of sixty pages, we find summaries of the extant poems of the "alliterative revival," and critical comments upon them. This part of the book does not offer much that cannot be found in Wells's *Manual*. The criticism is, at times, impressionistic, and in poems like *The wars of Alexander* whose source is known, it is not based on any thorough comparison with the original. Since summaries of these poems are available in Wells's book, they are hardly needed. Apparently Dr. Oakden felt so in some cases, for he gives no summary or criticism of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* and no summary of *Piers the Plowman*. His comments on *Piers* are hardly consistent. In one place he writes: "There is no subtly worked out allegory, part of a great central design; indeed the poem is lacking in form"—statements that certainly are not true of A1. On the other hand he says of the poem as a whole: "The result of this imaginative process is not a number of visions loosely strung together, but a unified structure in vision form." Can those statements be reconciled? At any rate, it would seem that only after one had forgotten much of the B and C texts could one hold the second of those views. Even more astonishing is the statement that Langland is "constructive," unless the adjective has its current colloquial meaning.

Seven pages are devoted to a pleasant summary of the theories concerning *Pearl*—a form of intellectual exercise much cultivated lately (see for instance the introduction to Professor Chase's translation and René Wellek's monograph [Prague, 1933]). The characterization of Professor Schofield's first arti-

cle as "little more than a literary curiosity" is surely unfortunate in view of the fact that it freed our minds from the follies of Gollancz's interpretation. Finally, Dr. Oakden gives his own interpretation, admittedly impressionistic—"we confess personally that we feel here is a poet trying to get over to us and win our sympathy in his loss"—and follows this sentence by a sensible suggestion that the pearl symbolizes "childlike innocence." The fault of the impressionistic method is obvious here, because many another reader may feel "personally" that the author's entire interest is in theology. In the last chapter of Part I Dr. Oakden presents parallels which seem to connect various texts, and a chart of the connections which they are supposed to establish. To some scholars, however, the chart will seem hardly convincing and the parallels will be valuable chiefly for what they exhibit of conventional alliterative diction. The last part of this chapter makes some significant points concerning the descriptive qualities of the alliterative poetry.

In the remaining parts of the book, we find the chief contribution to knowledge. They present a detailed study of the vocabulary and the alliterative phrases found in Middle English alliterative poetry. Whether complete in all details or not, the mass of material presented here is of value for the study of any alliterative text. Further, Dr. Oakden makes interesting generalizations concerning the use of alliterative words and phrases, words not found in prose, archaisms, technical terms, Old Norse words, and words limited to particular districts. Whatever correction of these generalizations will need to be made in the light of further study, the conceptions which they give of the artistic vocabulary of Middle English alliterative poetry must be in the main correct.

In the course of the book remarks naturally appear on problems of authorship. In general Dr. Oakden is cautious in assuming common authorship of any two poems (see esp. pp. 88-89). At one point he says: "The special value of the metrical test lies, however, on the negative side." Yet he still trusts too much to the value of parallel expressions and metrical analyses. In a footnote he says: "A detailed metrical study in statistical form of Skeats's texts (of *Piers the Plowman*) by the present writer seems to favour the theory of single authorship." Professor Chambers, the stoutest champion of single authorship, however, no longer asserts that the man who made the C text was the author of B. One suspects that by nature Dr. Oakden would trust implicitly metrical and linguistic evidence but is schooling himself to distrust it as a positive criterion. In any case there is a dilemma which, perhaps, he has not realized: If, aside from the five poems ascribed to the *Gawain* poet and aside from *Winner and waster* and *The parlement of the three ages*, and possibly *Alexander A* and *B*, every extant poem is by an independent writer, there must have been a large number of alliterative poems not known to us, for it is incredible that the authors of *Morte Arthure*, *The awntyrs of Arthure*, *The destruction of Jerusalem*, etc., wrote only one poem each. If a large proportion of the poems are not extant, influences which affected these writers can hardly be judged by the evidence which we can collect from the few poems which we have. Moreover,

poems by authors all of whose works have perished may have determined much of the course of the alliterative revival. Hence the futility of such efforts as that epitomized in the chart near the end of Part I. It would seem, then, that either, despite apparent differences, some of these poems *were* by the same author, or that it is hopeless for us to attempt reconstruction of the history of the revival.

JAMES R. HULBERT

University of Chicago

The early English carols. Edited by RICHARD LEIGHTON GREENE. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. cxlv+461; 1 plate.

This standard collection of English carols written before 1550 also contains a preface (pp. xiii-cxlv), describing the form and its problems, and notes (pp. 351-454), elucidating the difficulties in the texts. Greene follows medieval usage in defining a carol (p. xxii) as a poem "in stanzas, the form of which is not changed in the course of the poem" and to which is "prefixed a group of lines which forms a *burden* or chorus, to be sung (or considered as sung by a reader) before the first stanza and repeated after that and all succeeding stanzas." This definition, clearly supported, as it is, by early use, enables him to distinguish a group of nearly five hundred lyric texts written before 1550. He includes Richard Kele's *Christmas carolles* of 1550, the first collection of English carols to be printed, and thus finds a convenient stopping-place. He very properly distinguishes the medieval carol from the Christmas or Nativity songs and points out that the medieval carol has only a slight connection with French *noëls* (pp. xxiv-xxviii). As the form of the verse and the burden indicate, the carol is intimately associated with the dance (pp. xxix-lix). This stormy sea is safely crossed, and the analogies of the carol to medieval and later forms on the Continent are pointed out. The Latin background of the medieval carols is found in the borrowings of scraps of Latin hymns, proses, and antiphons to form a macaronic pattern. Some medieval Latin lyrics (*cantio* or *cantilena*) lend a few lines. Interesting and important is the distinction between ballad and carol (pp. xlviii-lvi). This is sharply made and will have a bearing in future discussions of ballad origins. The popular aspects of medieval carols appear particularly in the frequently used contrast of holly and ivy, in the free use of proverbs, and in other minor details. Greene discusses (pp. xeviii-ciii) the contrast of holly and ivy, a symbolism which is not fully understood, sufficiently for his purposes, but a wholly satisfactory explanation is yet to be found. In the following pages he takes up the carol and popular religion, showing the close connection between the medieval carol and the Franciscan order and the development of the carol as a Christmas song (pp. cxi-cxxxii). The final chapter of the introduction (pp. cxxiv-cxlv) analyzes the burden. All this is excellently done. The texts appear to be carefully

printed. No less than twenty-one carols are printed for the first time. About the same number of new variants, some of minor and some of major importance, are given. In addition to these new materials, Greene prints many texts found only in sources more or less difficult to see. All in all, he has given us a standard collection with an interesting description of the form.

Greene's notes are apposite. The following additions to the preface and notes are not intended as corrections, but rather as supplementation of what he has given and as evidence of my interest in his remarks. Several references here given must have appeared while Greene's book was in press. To the discussion of the word *carole* (pp. xiii ff.) add now P. Verrier, "La plus vieille citation de 'carole,'" *Romania*, LVIII (1932), 380-421, and to that of the famous dancers at Kölbigk add now Eduard Schröder, "Das Tanzlied von Kölbigk," *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse* (1933), pages 354-72, and John Meier, *Balladen*, I ("Deutsche Literatur" [Leipzig, 1935]), 12. Greene gives (p. ci) the oldest citation of the puzzling comparison "like an owl in an ivy-bush"; see Smith and Heseltine, *Oxford dictionary of English proverbs* (Oxford, 1935), page 44, and G. L. Apperson, *English proverbs and proverbial phrases* (London, 1929), page 479. German adaptations of secular songs to religious uses (p. cxix) are listed in Luise Berthold, *Beiträge zur hochdeutschen geistlichen Kontrafaktur vor 1500* (Marburg diss. [Lüneburg, 1920]; unfortunately only a part of the dissertation was printed); Kurt Hennig, *Die geistliche Kontrafaktur im Jahrhundert der Reformation* (Halle, 1909); F. A. Hünich, *Das Fortleben des älteren Volksliedes im Kirchenlied des 17. Jahrhunderts* ("Probefahrten," Vol. XXI [Leipzig, 1911]). When shall we have similar studies of English hymns? Greene suggests (p. cxxix) a good problem in the literary influence of the friars. Miss Sylvia Resnikow has an article soon to appear in the *Journal of English and Germanic philology* on "How Adam dalf and Eve splan" (p. cxliv). "Altissimus" (pp. 17, No. 23, stanza 4; 47, No. 75) is used of Jesus, as is frequently done in medieval German; see *Der Marner*, ed. P. Strauch (Strassburg, 1876), page 100 (XIII, 25); *Bruder Hansens Marienlieder*, ed. R. Minzloff (Hannover, 1863), page 144, line 1990; *Kaiserchronik*, ed. H. F. Massmann (Quedlinburg, 1854), III, 229; A. E. Schönbach, *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, XXVI (1882), 31 (*St. Christophorus*, l. 358), 55 (*ibid.*, l. 1131); F. Vetter, *Germania*, XXII (1877), 360, line 120. Today "the Most High" would naturally refer, I think, to God the Father, as "Altissimus" does in *Der jüngere Titrel*, ed. K. A. Hahn (Quedlinburg, 1842), page 6, strophe 60, and *Hugo von Montfort*, ed. J. E. Wackernell (Innsbruck, 1881), page 151 (XXXV, 30). For other comparisons see J. Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, page 19.

For the many comparisons applied to the Virgin Mary see Anselm Salzer, *Die Sinnbilder und Beiwörter Mariens in der deutschen Literatur und lateinischen Hymnenpoesie des Mittelalters* (Linz, 1886-93). This dictionary of epithets and comparisons would have been useful in connection with the com-

monplace (p. 357, No. 21; p. 361, No. 44; p. 363, No. 56; p. 364, No. 66; p. 376, No. 124) of the sun passing through glass and leaving it unbroken; see now my essay, "What goes through water and is not wet?" *MLN*, LI (1936), 86-90; Yrjö Hirn, "La verrière symbolique de la maternité virginale," *Neu-philologische Mitteilungen*, XXIX (1928), 33-39; and W. von Wickede, *Die geistlichen Gedichte des Cm. 714* (Rostock diss. [Hamburg, 1909]), page 99. Salzer's collections might have been cited to illustrate the comparison of the body of the Virgin to a tower of ivory (p. 355, No. 133; see Salzer, p. 617), a rose (p. 389, No. 173; see Salzer, p. 607), a lily (p. 389, No. 174; see Salzer, p. 605), and a well or spring (p. 406, No. 306; see Salzer, p. 602). "Bereth the belle" (p. 359, No. 30) remains a puzzling phrase to denote excellence (see Apperson, p. 30; Smith-Heseltine, p. 498). The punishment (p. 380, No. 137) of hanging in a "lepe" (basket) is very curious (see J. W. Spargo, *Virgil the necromancer* ["Harvard studies in comparative literature," X (Cambridge, Mass., 1934)], pp. 375 ff.). Is the proverb "Hyre and se, and sey not" (p. 418, No. 345) connected with the three monkeys which "hear no evil, see no evil, and speak no evil"? For the personification Sir Penny (p. 419, No. 347) see *Die Gedichte Reinmars von Zweter*, ed. G. Roethe (Leipzig, 1887), page 589 (note on 81, 7); J. Bolte, *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, XLVIII (1906), 13-56, and *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie* (1925), pages 89-114 (cf. O. Clemen, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, LII [1927], 423); *Hans Sachs-Forschungen: Festschrift zur 400-jährigen Feier Hans Sachs*, ed. A. L. Stiefel (Nuremberg, 1894), page 179; R. Koch, *Klagen mittelalterlicher Didaktiker* (Diss. [Göttingen, 1931]), pages 36-39. The punishment of hanging a stone about the neck of a criminal (p. 453, No. 471) is familiar in medieval Germany; see G. Schreiber, *Wallfahrt und Volkstum* ("Forschungen zur Volkskunde," Nos. 16-17 [Düsseldorf, 1934]), page 242; Eberhard, Freiherr von Künnsberg, "Rechtsgeschichte und Volkskunde," *Jahrbuch für historische Volkskunde*, I (1925), 102-6. The last four carols are nonsense-rhymes filled with impossibilities and contradictions. A commentary on these carols would have to be very extensive and Greene wisely desists.

ARCHER TAYLOR

University of Chicago

The Oxford dictionary of English proverbs. By WILLIAM GEORGE SMITH. With Introduction and Index by JANET E. HESELTINE. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. xxviii+644.

Students of English literature and folk lore will welcome this addition to their resources and will set it beside G. L. Apperson's *English proverbs and proverbial phrases: a historical dictionary* (London, 1929). Comparison of the two works is obviously called for. The first striking difference lies in the method of arrangement: Apperson arranges the proverbs, except for certain large groups, according to the most important word; Smith follows an alphabetical arrangement according to the first word. Comparison of individual entries shows much duplication. Apperson endeavored to compile all of the proverbs

printed in collections down to 1732. He excluded sententious and moral observations which had no currency as proverbs, and foreign sayings. Smith seems to have been somewhat more generous in accepting foreign proverbs. He includes "A fool, unless he knows Latin, is never a great fool" (p. 10), "Every cask smells of the wine it holds" (p. 94), "Every dog is a lion at home" (p. 95), and many another. Naturally enough Apperson and Smith supplement each other, as we may see in the example of "A fool's bolt is soon shot." Smith gives (p. 10) an example from A.D. 1225; both give the instances in the *Proverbs of Alfred* and the *Proverbs of Hendyng*; Smith gives examples from 1375 and 1450 and Apperson one from 1460; Smith cites an instance, which Apperson should not have missed, in Heywood (1546); Apperson has an example from 1583; both cite *Henry V*, and Smith adds an allusion in *As you like it*; Apperson has an example from 1667; both quote Smollett (1748); Apperson concludes with two examples from the nineteenth century. Obviously both Apperson and Smith must be consulted for English proverbs.

In a work which treats so many details as a dictionary of proverbs it is easy to suggest minor additions or corrections, and such suggestions cast no reflections on the merit of the work. I should have cited B. C. Williams' edition of the Old English gnomic verses (although it does not rest on a new collation) for "So many countries, so many laws" (p. 396). In the *Studier tilläggnade E. A. Kock* (Lund, 1934), pages 385-86, I discussed "Tib's eve" (p. 492), but this was too recent for possible inclusion. The addition "As the old woman said when she saw a black man" to the proverb "Many a thing's made for money" (p. 287) should not have been termed "ridiculous." The two parts form a familiar proverb of international currency (see Taylor, *An index to the "Proverb"* [Helsinki, 1935], p. 12). Such proverbs including a conversation—the so-called Wellerisms—seem to have been only casually recognized by Smith. Excellent is the collection of figurative negatives (pp. 327-28) like "Not worth a straw." On "Speech is silver, silence golden" (p. 402) see Richard Jente, *PMLA*, XLVIII (1933), 33-37. Smith, who often indicates—as Apperson does less frequently—the sources of the proverbs, might have noted this as Oriental in origin. The explanation (p. 524) of "To kick the bucket" is the first attempt I have seen to explain this puzzling phrase.

Smith uses the sources we might expect him to choose. He should have noted (p. xxvi) that the proverbs in Camden's *Remaines concerning Britaine* (1614)—there are no proverbs in the first edition of 1605 (pace Apperson, p. vii)—are derived from Jan Gruter's *Florilegium* (Frankfurt a. M., 1611); see Taylor, "Proverbia Britannica," *Washington University studies*, XI (1924), 409-23. Smith keeps the error of the German printer of 1611 in "Where wine is not common, commons must be sent," which should read "Where coine is not common, commons must be scant." We are still looking forward to Max Förster's promised reprint of the several editions of the proverbs in the *Remaines*. The note on the "Durham proverbs" (pp. ix, n. 1; xxvii-xxviii) promises us the publication of an interesting collection of the eleventh century. Janet Heseltine's introduction is stimulating. She might have men-

tioned the *Catalogue des livres parémiologiques composant la bibliothèque de Ignace Bernstein* (Warsaw, 1900) as an indispensable bibliographical tool and possibly [Grattet-]Duplessis, *Bibliographie parémiologique* (Paris, 1847). Since the *Oxford dictionary* includes many proverbial comparisons, A. M. Hyamson's *Dictionary of English phrases* (London, 1922) might have been mentioned.

ARCHER TAYLOR

University of Chicago

Gentlefolk in the making: studies in the history of English courtesy literature and related topics from 1531 to 1774. By JOHN E. MASON. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1935. Pp. xiv+393.

Dr. Mason modestly asserts:

The only claim made for the present study is that it traces in outline the picture of the English gentleman and gentlewoman as usually portrayed in didactic treatises between the time of Elyot and that of Chesterfield, and attempts to do justice to the literary and social merits of typical works containing such portraiture, showing whence the authors' ideas were, on the whole, derived, and in what the composite result of their labors consisted [p. 3].

A brief general discussion of the varieties of courtesy books before 1531, which Dr. Mason hopes to enlarge later as a separate study, is followed by a treatment of main tendencies during the remainder of the sixteenth century. In this period, he says, four types of courtesy books, representing "four traditions of conduct literature," become prominent: "They are first, parental advice; second, formal treatises on the conduct of gentlemen and gentlewomen; third, policy; and fourth, civility" (p. 57). These types determine the organization of the rest of the study, and the method of exposition followed is, roughly, that of abstracting in chronological series the books under each of these types and supplying appropriate comments and conclusions. In the process the author has found it necessary "to select what appears, on the whole, most characteristic and important" (p. 3). Although one should not insist on a rigidly consistent principle of selection, a definition of "characteristic and important" might have afforded helpful guidance for the reader. It is abundantly clear, however, that in making his abstracts Dr. Mason has displayed an admirable sense of proportion and has not overlooked the element of human interest.

Obviously, the primary aim of this method of treatment is to produce a history of courtesy books, and, as such, it may be added, this work is to be commended for its scholarly and thorough handling of myriads of details. But it is clearly intended to be, or does become, a history of ideas as well, and to an intricate movement of ideas the method here employed does not seem to give adequate perspective. In other words, that modification of ideas and attitudes which, in most instances, is very slow to reveal itself in material which has upon it the weight of tradition and convention, and those shifts of emphasis which are difficult to detect and to follow, do not become clear from

such a presentation. Similar ideas may be widely scattered among abstracts of books and may be too much entangled with other ideas for modifications of them to be defined with reasonable certainty. If the subject is to be studied for what it essentially is, as a movement of ideas, as a great tradition, it would seem that an additional approach is necessary—an approach which would secure unity by selecting as themes those problems which writers of courtesy recognized as such and with respect to which some kind of change occurs. To give but a few obvious examples, changes of attitudes in the treatment of such themes as studies and recreations, or woman in all her various rôles, or the man of learning, or the man of the world, can only be seen for what they really are in a unified study of the evidence bearing on each theme.

Dr. Mason is well aware (p. 291) that "the term 'courtesy book' . . . is a difficult one to define" and that "in particular cases it is not always easy to draw the line which separates the courtesy book from the social essay, the satire, the character sketch, or even the sermon." I should add that it is equally difficult to defend the types according to which Dr. Mason has organized his study—difficult because these types are not mutually exclusive, so that scores of books might be treated under two or more classifications. An arrangement by types, therefore, even where they are broad, as they are here, is almost certain to be rather arbitrary and artificial than real.

The commentary to this volume, which reveals an admirably careful and thorough use of bibliographical helps and secondary sources, is both full and detailed, and will prove valuable to all researchers in the field of social literature. By placing it at the end of the volume, however, without providing it with recurring chapter and page references to the main body of the text, the author has rendered its use needlessly difficult for the critical reader. A bibliography of courtesy books from 1625 onward and of secondary works relating to them has long been needed as a supplement to the valuable bibliography by Miss Ruth Kelso (1926). The bibliography to this volume, which Dr. Mason plans to issue separately, should fill that need.

His study provides excellent descriptions of the content of courtesy books, and, since full analyses of unprinted and extremely rare items are given, the work is by far the best manual now available for the study of English courtesy books. Not only has the author thoroughly combed the field for hitherto neglected treatises (and he has brought many to light), but he has made splendid use of all the scholarship bearing on his field of interest. A study of courtesy, however, which would enable the student to view it as a great tradition and to follow it in all its intricacies, is still to be written. I venture to say that when such a study is produced it will be written not as a history of courtesy books but as a history of ideas, showing their appearance and disappearance, and their alteration as they were conditioned by social change and by influences from foreign cultures.

VIRGIL B. HELTZEL

Northwestern University

French dramatic literature in the seventeenth century, Part III: 1652-1672.

By H. C. LANCASTER. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1936. 2 vols. Pp. 893.

In his two most recent volumes on the drama of the seventeenth century in France, Professor Lancaster has again given splendid evidence of how much tireless research can bring to light in regard to topics that seem worn lifeless by centuries of blind or prejudiced speculation. These two volumes are extremely interesting because they deal with the years 1652-72 and therefore include Molière's period of greatest activity, Corneille's later years which, notwithstanding the writer's age, are full of the freshness of his experiment-loving temperament, and the beginning of Racine's career, a more complete discussion of which will follow in the writer's still unpublished volumes. Not only have we an understanding commentary on the works of these men, but we can at last see them surrounded by the lesser writers of their time, influencing them and influenced by them; we see them caught in the theatrical entanglements and in the jealousies and the political web of the day, and we begin to realize how much genius owes to chance, to pressure, to the past, and to the immediate present.

Volume I opens with an introduction giving the general background for the twenty years under discussion in which some three hundred plays are to be studied. Instead of treating the entire history of each dramatic genre for the entire period *en bloc*, the author has preferred to carry the several genres abreast, as it were, thus making us more aware of the changes in popular taste from year to year. For instance, comedy, the most important genre of the period, is handled in four periods of several years each, tragedy in three, and tragi-comedy in two. Twelve out of the twenty-one chapters are given to comedy, three to tragedy, two to tragi-comedy, one to satires, one to the amateur religious play, and one to "machine" plays. This method makes the vast amount of complicated material less difficult to handle, though it inevitably causes the presentation to seem somewhat piecemeal and detached at times. The second volume closes with a list of the extant plays of the period, an index, and a supplement to Parts I and II.

These two volumes serve a double purpose in that they give us details about seventeenth-century drama in greater abundance and with greater accuracy than has been done up to the present, and in that they treat in the light of this general material the greatest authors of the day. Viewed in this way, the seventeenth century seems rather disconcertingly unclassical with its fondness for tragi-comedies, "machine" plays, farces, the *commedia dell'arte*, religious plays; its invention of the *comédie-ballet*; its innovations in meter and its use of subjects drawn from the Middle Ages and the East (and here Mr. Lancaster deprives Voltaire in favor of Chappuzeau of the credit of being the first Frenchman to lay the scene of a play in China). As in his previous volumes, the author gives much information on the theatrical companies then

active, discussing their repertoires, their adversities, their rivalries, and of course their actors, many of whom are proved to have been very active in writing for the stage. In the case of plays, their structure, their adherence to the unities and the *bienséances*, their inclusion of manners, and their popularity both then and later are discussed. Spanish influence seems to account largely for the complicated intrigues frequent in the first few years of the period, but the younger writers are already showing an inclination for French, Italian, and Latin sources.

Mr. Lancaster's pages on Molière are particularly valuable, for he has resolutely looked at Molière from a practical point of view as impresario-actor-writer and not as reformer and philosopher. This common-sense attitude is rendered more possible with the whole century at hand. No amount of fact will ever stop the world from interpreting Molière as it pleases, but it is well that we should have this accurate check of definite information on the times to make us see how often necessity, practicability, a sense of what the public would like, determined Molière's plays. As the director of a company eager for success, no writer would have risked ridiculing such prominent women as Mme de Rambouillet and Mlle de Scudéry, as Molière is sometimes said to have done. As for the story of the mysterious *précieuse* who is supposed to have interfered with the performance of the *Précieuses ridicules*, it can easily be explained away by a number of practical reasons which might have caused Molière to suspend the play himself. Practical considerations also aid in understanding *Don Juan*. Mr. Lancaster feels sure that Molière was attracted to the subject by the Italian actors who we now know were giving their *Festin de pierre* in 1664, and by the fact that a play on the same subject was being given at the Hôtel de Bourgogne and another in the provinces. Molière's deviation from the rules of the "well-made" play may be not so much a matter of momentary preference as mere lack of time. *Amphitryon* is undoubtedly more easily understood if viewed from a practical approach. Molière wanted to write a "machine" play to rival the successes of the Marais in that genre. This new interest would naturally have sent him to a recent and successful play of the sort, Rotrou's *Deux sosies*, which had been revived shortly before with special emphasis on the machines. The theme was already too commonly in use for Molière to have thought of its being interpreted as relating to the King's private affairs. Mr. Lancaster also shows little sympathy with the legend that in his *Amour médecin* the playwright ridiculed court physicians since there is very little in support of the story and it is contrary to the writer's usual practice.

In looking for sources Mr. Lancaster turns first to an author's own previous work, and then scrutinizes his contemporaries before seeking in more remote corners of literature. Thus he accounts for the study of jealousy in *Sganarelle* by the presence of that subject in *Don Garcie* and in the Italian source for that play rather than by Molière's still unproved marital difficulties which were as yet some distance off. Most of the *Misanthrope* can be traced back

to earlier productions of the author, and *L'Avare* is more immediately indebted to contemporary French works than to Plautus. And it seems more probable that Molière took his idea for his *comédie-ballets* not so much from the ancients and the Spaniards as from similar experiments already tried in France in his own time.

Working from his practical knowledge of the seventeenth century, Mr. Lancaster has unhesitatingly destroyed a good many cherished legends. He robs Thomas Corneille of the credit of having produced in *Timocrate* the most popular play of the century. He restores to Dorimond the reputation, long accredited to Molière, of having first used *Ecole* in a title. He wipes out the *belles impiétés* long supposed to have lurked in Cyrano de Bergerac's *Mort d'Agrippine*, showing amusingly enough how as the years have passed information regarding the play's atheism has become "more precise." Again it is by heeding the usual conduct of rival theaters that Mr. Lancaster is able to lay to rest that literary ghost of Henriette d'Angleterre's influence in the case of *Bérénice* and *Tite et Bérénice*. The interesting legend obscured the less romantic explanation that the Hôtel de Bourgogne was irritated to see Corneille writing *Tite et Bérénice* for Molière's troupe and urged Racine to write a rival play on the same subject. The explanation is so in keeping with other incidents of the period that there seems little room to question it. It becomes at least easier to understand if not to pardon Racine for his treatment of Molière when we learn that Racine took his first play to Molière's company only because he would have had to wait so long before having it staged at the Hôtel de Bourgogne, and Molière took the *Thébaïde* to fill a gap left by La Calprenède, whose promised play had not been forthcoming.

There are often moments when the reader is tempted to wish that Mr. Lancaster had been willing, after having destroyed the underbrush of dead tradition and unsupported speculation, to give more emphasis to the great men, leaving the mediocre to fill in a background. But each tree in this forest is numbered and every branch is lettered, and the result is that the reader feels himself in a botanical garden and not in one landscaped to impress with beauty of line and mass and color. The author has divested himself of any purpose other than to expose the contents of every play obtainable and the interrelationships of these plays; hence the book lacks the impelling force of a great idea or theory. Notwithstanding the attempt at utter impersonality, the author enlivens the grayness of tone by unexpected sarcasms and by a somewhat cavalier disregard for critics with whom he disagrees,¹ proving again the extreme difficulty of attaining complete objectivity. But much can be forgiven an author who has made so invaluable a contribution to the study of drama. The defect (if there is a single one) of this work is inadequate generalization, the failure to set authors and their works in true perspective; meanwhile few scholars possess Mr. Lancaster's energy and interest which

¹ The writer is particularly unfair in his summary (p. 235) of Miss Wheatley's *Molière and Terence*, which contains much more material than it is credited with.

make it possible to wrestle with countless details and render them readily accessible to others. As in his previous volumes, the author has not only indicated available material but also that which has still proved unavailable, and consequently his book is rich in suggestions for further work.²

HILDA L. NORMAN

University of Chicago

John Arbuthnot, mathematician and satirist. By LESTER M. BEATTIE. ("Harvard studies in English," Vol. XVI.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935. Pp. xvi+432.

Ever since his death John Arbuthnot has held an honorable position in the pages of literary history as something like "chief of the minor writers" of his period. Obviously not a major figure to be classed with his friends Pope and Swift (despite Dr. Johnson's calling him "the first man among them"), he has never slipped down among the Philips, the Fentons, and the Budgells. Yet more than a century and a half passed after his death before a scholarly biography or reprint of his major pieces appeared and, in a period when scholarship has found time to devote full-dress studies to Robert Jephson, Mrs. Sarah Scott, James Harris, and Amelie Opie, almost another half-century has gone by with little more attention to Arbuthnot than the efforts of a foreign scholar to turn the several direct denials of authorship in the *Journal to Stella* and the fact (as demonstrated by nearly fifty pages of parallels) that both *John Bull* and Swift's works were written in the English language into proof that Swift was the real author of Arbuthnot's masterpiece. Now, in the year of his bicentennial, amends have come in the form of a long and illuminating study by Mr. Beattie.

In order to understand the extent and value of Mr. Beattie's work, however, one must consider the reasons for the scanty record of scholarship on Arbuthnot. A primary one is that Arbuthnot belongs in that most difficult class for scholars to handle, the men who are more important than their work. For the man about whom Swift said that were there a dozen like him he would "burn his Travels" was a more capable, influential, and significant person than the author of his modest satiric and scientific pieces. Other difficulties lie in the variety of his interests (which, in addition to literature, science, and learning, included politics, music, and business), in the doubt and confusion connected with the bibliography of his works, in the absence of needed biographical data, in the complexity of his literary relationships, and in the exceedingly topical character of many of the allusions in his satires. This last constitutes an especial difficulty. The pages of Swift, of Addison, of Steele show us how small the intellectual world of the time was and to what a surprising extent the satirist might rely on the public to catch allusions to incidents a decade old. But Arbuthnot, possessed of a prodigious memory

² The text is remarkably free of typographical errors: p. 22, l. 3, read 1665 for 1667; p. 32, l. 3 from bottom of page, read with for when; p. 656, l. 2, read worldly for wordly.

and a naturally eclectic mind, outdid even Pope in the use of obscure and dated material. It is no exaggeration to say that bits of *John Bull* and whole sections of the *Memoirs of Scriblerus* were beyond all but the most well-informed contemporaries.

Under these conditions what was much needed both for itself and as a groundwork for other studies was an orderly analysis and account of Arbuthnot's work, both literary and scientific. This Mr. Beattie has provided. In his study the various types of Arbuthnot's writings are treated in successive chapters. Under each heading the individual pieces are described in detail and with sufficient quotation to make their character clear (a form of treatment which is especially useful in the case of the scientific works which the reader is never likely to see) and intelligently discussed as to point, quality, background, date of composition, etc.

But though this is the basic pattern, it by no means constitutes the whole of Mr. Beattie's study. The chapters devoted to the *John Bull* pamphlets and the satires on Woodward extend far beyond the confines of the pattern, and the whole discussion of the works has been preceded by a rather sketchy account of Arbuthnot's political and scientific career and followed by an excellent summary and judgment of the man.

Of all the parts, naturally the largest and most important is that concerned with *John Bull*. Here, after a preliminary sketch of the fable and a consideration of Teerink's theory that Swift was the real author of the pamphlets (a theory based on such absurd evidence that it hardly seems worth a tenth of the twenty-two pages Mr. Beattie devotes to disproving it), we have a series of very interesting studies on such subjects as the sources of the animal names, the origin of the figure Sir Humphrey Polesworth (which still remains an intriguing mystery), and the treatment, in the satire, of Marlborough, Holland, Scotland, the church, and passive obedience.

Scarcely second in importance and interest is the chapter devoted to the satires on Woodward. Mr. Beattie is to be greatly commended for the considerable research he has done on this strange, brilliant, quarrelsome Greshamite. In addition to providing a background for some of Arbuthnot's satires, the story of Dr. Woodward's career does more to explain the contemporary attitude toward science and scientists than does a whole file of the *Philosophical transactions*.

Though Mr. Beattie's study is written throughout with unusual grace and felicity of expression, he has occasionally allowed his points to be obscured and weakened by the inclusion in the text of considerable blocks of incidentally informative material which would find an equally useful and less obtrusive place in footnotes and appendixes. And naturally in dealing with such complex material he has occasionally made statements which readers will challenge. Many of these, such as, for instance, the implication (on p. 265) that the *Memoirs of Scriblerus* were packed away on the breakup of the club and not worked on again until Pope edited them after Arbuthnot's death,

are of relatively small moment in his study. More disturbing are several of his identifications of the sources of some of Arbuthnot's ideas. Though it is easy to prove that Arbuthnot made use of all sorts of contemporary material, many readers will find themselves unconvinced that in writing *John Bull* Arbuthnot drew, consciously or unconsciously, on Leslie's *Rehearsal* or De-foe's *Review* to the extent Mr. Beattie believes, or that the origin of the family name of Bulstrode had anything to do with the choosing of the name John Bull.

Now that Mr. Beattie's study has paved the way, it is to be hoped that more scholars will turn their attention to Arbuthnot. Many other types of study are needed, especially a new biography (though this probably must await the discovery of further unpublished correspondence) and a thoroughly annotated edition of *John Bull*.

CHARLES KERBY-MILLER

University of Chicago

Diderot's Supplément au voyage de Bougainville. Edited by GILBERT CHINARD. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. Pp. 213.

M. Chinard offers another contribution to the history of "soft" primitivism in a new and definitive edition of Diderot's *Supplément au voyage de Bougainville*. Giving striking and extreme expression to many primitivistic ideas current in the eighteenth century, the *Supplément* occupies an important place in the history of ideas, and in many ways "peut être considéré comme la suprême expression et le testament de la philosophie naturiste de XVIII^e siècle" (p. 42). For his edition M. Chinard has used the Leningrad manuscript which there is every reason to believe was prepared at Diderot's order and under his direction. This manuscript differs from all editions of the *Supplément* in the addition of the history of Polly Baker, a story which exemplifies some of the essential ideas of the *Supplément*. M. Chinard's notes contain variant readings from other editions, passages from Bougainville's *Voyage autour du monde* which illuminate ideas in the *Supplément*, and references to other eighteenth-century expressions of these ideas. Diderot's résumé of the *Voyage autour du monde* and the note "À l'éditeur," written by l'Abbé de Vauxcelles, who first published the *Supplément* in 1796, are included in the appendixes.

The introduction to this edition is as important to the student of ideas as is the text. M. Chinard sketches in broad outlines the history of *le mirage tahitien* from its roots in the ancient belief in *les Terres Australes* through the latter part of the eighteenth century, the period of its great vogue. He shows especially the importance to this history of Bougainville's *Voyage autour du monde* and of the *Supplément*. He analyzes both at considerable length, and discusses the relation of the latter to Buffon, Rousseau, Montesquieu, Morelly, d'Holbach, and other philosophers of the eighteenth century, and its anticipation of some, at least, of the ideas prominent in the nineteenth-century philosophy of *la pitié sociale*. He also establishes a new date for the

composition of the *Supplément*: the autumn of 1772, instead of 1771, the date given in Assézat and Tourneux's edition.

The scope of the material covered in the introduction is at the same time a source of strength and of weakness. The thread of the central narrative is admirably clear. But the simplification which contributes to this clarity leaves one with only the most general impressions of the history of *le mirage tahitien* in France. A few of the undercurrents which complicate its history (cannibalism, human sacrifice, infanticide, etc.) are referred to, but many remain untouched or are mentioned only in passing. One wonders, for example, to what extent the Tahitians were regarded as living in "a state of nature." It is almost a commonplace in the voyages to distinguish between savages in a "true" state of nature (usually exemplified by the Pecherais in the Straits of Magellan, the Terra del Fuegians, the New Zealanders, and the New Hollanders) and the Tahitians, already considerably advanced in civilization. Bougainville implies such a distinction in his description of the Pecherais (quoted by M. Chinard, p. 112, n. 1); we find it also, for example, in Hawkesworth's *Voyages*,¹ in accounts of Cook's voyages,² and in Forster's *Observations* . . . ,³ all of which were well known in France. Did this distinction have a place in French primitivist writings? Again, the student of "soft" primitivism questions whether or not the discovery of other islands and other savages in the South Seas affected the history of *le mirage tahitien* in France. M. Chinard refers briefly, for instance, to the "touching history of Lee Boo, Prince of the Pelew Islands" (p. 78) and, in a footnote (p. 78, n. 2), states that Keate's *Account of the Pelew Islands* was translated into French in the same year in which it was published in England. But he does not indicate whether or not the Pelew Islanders rivaled the Tahitians as noble savages in France—as they did in England—or in any way affected *le mirage tahitien*.

He shows clearly, however, the importance to the development of the *mirage* in France of accounts of English voyages to the South Seas in the 1760's and 1770's. In particular, he discusses the account of Cook's first voyage as it was given to the public in Hawkesworth's celebrated compilation, *An account of the voyages . . . performed by Commodore Byron, Captain Wallis, Captain Carteret and Captain Cook*. . . . In his discussion M. Chinard presents Hawkesworth as a great admirer of the noble savage, and one who modified by his comments the rather dry and barren journals of Cook and Banks. The Tahitian "légende," says M. Chinard, "n'y perdit rien" by these com-

¹ John Hawkesworth, *An account of the voyages . . . by Commodore Byron, Captain Wallis, Captain Carteret, and Captain Cook* . . . (London, 1773), I, 392; II, 59.

² James Cook, *A voyage towards the South Pole . . . in the years 1772, 1773, 1774 and 1775* (Dublin, 1777), I, 100, 242; George Forster, *A voyage round the world in his Britannic Majesty's sloop, Resolution, commanded by Capt. James Cook* . . . (London, 1777), I, 225, 366; John Ledyard, *A journal of Captain Cook's last voyage* . . . (Hartford, 1783), p. 12; James Cook and James King, *A voyage to the Pacific Ocean* . . . (Dublin, 1784), I, lxxiii, lxxvii.

³ John Reinhold Forster, *Observations made during a voyage round the world* . . . (London, 1778), pp. ii, 286-95, 317-26, 380-81.

ments (p. 73). By way of illustrating Hawkesworth's handling of the material, he discusses three passages familiar to the student of "soft" primitivism: one, in which Hawkesworth states that the Tahitians have a knowledge of right and wrong "from the mere dictates of natural conscience"; a second, in which he describes a celebration of the "rites of Venus" and poses the question whether or not the shame "attending certain of men's actions" is innate or implanted by custom; and a third, in which Hawkesworth meditates on the happiness of the savage.

The first of these statements has assumed an importance in the history of "soft" primitivism which it does not deserve. Hawkesworth's comment is based upon the following incident. Tubourai Tamaidé, a friendly savage who had not stolen from the English, was wrongly accused of theft by his friend Banks. When his innocence was proved, he was much moved, and asked Banks to kill him if ever he should steal from his friend. Then follows Hawkesworth's comment:

Upon this occasion it may be observed, that these people have a knowledge of right and wrong from the mere dictates of natural conscience; and involuntarily condemn themselves when they do that to others, which they would condemn others for doing to them. That Tubourai Tamaidé felt the force of moral obligation, is certain; for the imputation of an action which he considered as indifferent, would not, when it appeared to be groundless, have moved him with such excess of passion [II, 101-2].

In this context the statement seems to refer merely to what the Tahitians regard as the "rights" of friendship and hospitality; the action of theft the savage regarded as indifferent. This opinion is strengthened by consideration of the next sentence in the passage: "We must indeed estimate the virtue of these people, by the only standard of morality, the conformity of their conduct to what in their opinion is right. . . ."

But an interesting and significant shift in emphasis occurs in the French translation (1774) of Hawkesworth's account, which M. Chinard uses for his discussion. Here Tubourai Tamaidé does not regard the action of theft as indifferent. "Il est sûr," says the translation, "que Tubourai Tamaidé sentoit la force de l'obligation morale; s'il avoit regardé comme indifférent l'action qu'on lui imputoit, il n'auroit pas été si agité, lorsqu'on démonstra la fausseté de l'accusation."⁴ In the light of this emphasis, the "knowledge of right and wrong" might well have the broader meaning which M. Chinard sees in it. But this emphasis is not Hawkesworth's.

Another shift in emphasis has occurred in the translation of the second passage used by M. Chinard to show Hawkesworth's influence on the Tahitian mirage. Hawkesworth refers to the desire of the English to acquaint the natives with their religious beliefs. They consequently invite the savages to a divine service, which Captain Cook conducts amid the respectful silence of

⁴ *Relation des voyages entrepris par ordre de Sa Majesté Britannique ...* (Paris, 1774), II, 341.

the natives. "Such," says Hawkesworth, "were our Matins; our Indians thought fit to perform Vespers of a very different kind" (II, 128). He then relates the incident of a young man and girl performing "the rites of Venus" before a crowd of natives and English. It is clear, however, in Hawkesworth's account, that he does not regard this incident as an actual religious ceremony, that he refers to it as "Vespers" only by way of transition from his account of the English religious service. The translator of this passage, however, does treat the incident as a religious ceremony: "Les Indiens après avoir vu nos ceremonies religieuses dans la matinée, jugèrent à propos de nous montrer dans l'après-midi les leurs, qui étoient très différentes" (II, 373-74). This emphasis acquires added importance when we read Voltaire's reaction to the account, quoted by Chinard (p. 76):

Je suis encore dans l'île de Taïti; j'y admire la diversité de la nature; j'y vois avec édification la reine du pays assister à une communion de l'Eglise anglicane, et inviter les Anglais au service divin qu'on fait dans le royaume. Ce service divin consiste à faire coucher ensemble un jeune homme et une jeune fille ... On peut assurer que les habitants de Taïti ont conservé dans toute sa pureté la plus ancienne religion de la terre.

By this time Oberea—who is not even mentioned in Hawkesworth's account of the English service—has become an assistant in an Anglican communion, and Hawkesworth's "Vespers of a very different kind" have become proof that the Tahitians have preserved in all its purity the most ancient religion on earth!

Finally, M. Chinard comments upon what he regards as Hawkesworth's disquietude at the happiness of the savage. Almost in spite of himself, says M. Chinard, Hawkesworth admits that "si, tout considéré, l'on admet qu'ils sont plus heureux que nous, il faut dire que l'enfant est plus heureux que l'homme, et que nous avons perdu du côté de la félicité, en perfectionnant notre nature, en augmentant nos connoissances et en étendant nos vues." "Et voilà," comments M. Chinard, "de nouveau l'éternel procès contre la civilisation et la société" (pp. 75-76). But Hawkesworth himself here does little more than raise the question whether or not we become less happy as we increase in knowledge and enlarge our views; in the introduction to his account, however, he ranges himself definitely on the side of civilization:

Will it be said, that to exercise the faculties which are the distinguishing characteristics of our nature is unnatural? and that being endowed with the various powers which in civil societies only can be brought into action, it was incongruous to the will of our Creator that any such society should be formed, and that it would be pleasing to him if, still continuing in a savage state, these powers should lie torpid in our nature, like life in an embryo, during the whole of our existence? This surely must appear extravagant and absurd in the highest degree . . . [I, xviii-xix].

Indeed, Hawkesworth's comments in his account are so frequently anti-primitivistic that one feels the need of a revaluation of his influence in the history of *le mirage tahitien*.

But, with the exception of the treatment of Hawkesworth, the faults one finds with M. Chinard's study are faults of omission—probably to be explained by the necessary brevity of an introduction. The student of "soft" primitivism can only hope that he will fill in, in other studies, the outlines he so clearly presents in this one.

CLARA R. LESHER

University of Chicago

Germany in the eighteenth century: the social background of the literary revival.

By W. H. BRUFORD. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1935. Pp. x+354.

This work will introduce modern German history and culture to the non-German student better than any other volume in English; in fact, better than almost any volume in German. Within the space of 327 pages Mr. Bruford has brought together a large body of knowledge which is both clearly and compactly handled. He has selected his illustrative material with such care and precision that the complicated thought of the book almost always can be easily followed. And he has eminently succeeded in imparting to his study the simplicity of outline which reveals the author's thorough knowledge of the period and understanding of his problem. One seldom meets a book to which this praise can be given; the author should be congratulated on his ability to compress information without sacrificing either perspicuity or vividness.

Mr. Bruford intends his volume "to provide material for a sociological study of eighteenth-century German literature by describing the chief classes of society in that age, and the political and economic conditions under which they lived." In the final chapter he discusses some general features of that literature "which seem to have resulted from the reactions of whole groups to political and social conditions, rather than from the fortuitous similarity of individual points of view." The author tries to explain the sudden and glorious flowering of German literature in the last part of the century and to note some of the distinguishing traits of German national character. The value of his study lies in the combination of diverse materials and points of view for a single purpose. Mr. Bruford shows that he has mastered the literature in the fields of economic, social, and institutional history, and that he is equally at home in the realm of culture. By bringing these data together he has proved how illuminating each can be for the other. He is employing in this respect the recent method of studying literature in its sociological setting, what the Germans call *Kulturkunde*; although it should not be ignored that his knowledge of literature and culture imparts an added meaning and color to economic, social, and institutional history.

The organization of the book reveals the author's general thesis. After a survey of the "political structure and system of government," Mr. Bruford discusses "the old order of society—Nobility and Peasantry." He then treats

"the new order of society—the Middle Class," and concludes with the "Reactions on literature." In other words, he contends that

Among the actual creators of literature [in the 17th century] the middle class was just as strongly represented as at any time in the following century. The difference between the content and tone of their serious work, from which a realistic treatment of middle-class types was strictly excluded, and that of the later periods, would seem to have been very largely due to causes of a social and political nature, to that gradual social rise of the middle class described in earlier chapters [p. 311].

Therein lies the justification for Mr. Bruford's kind of study. The rise of the literature and of the middle class forms one story. The eighteenth century witnessed the vigorous development of both. But Mr. Bruford does not identify the two entirely. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of his final chapter, "The influence of political, economic and social factors in literature," consists in his showing how much the old order of society continued to affect the literature. The author characterizes the literature in terms of this double setting in a highly stimulating manner.

In the composition of a study as compact as this one, the author can scarcely be expected not to make some statements which will be questioned and which, now and then, fall below his high level of clarity. The reviewer would like to see more work done on the social and cultural history of the several classes. German political historians have belittled the political significance and intelligence of the middle class, and some more precise estimate needs to be made of the general caliber of this group. Our knowledge of the culture of the ordinary aristocrat is also deficient. The reviewer doubts whether the justification for the aristocratic privileges had diminished so greatly as the author believes; the history of Germany since the eighteenth century seems to prove that this aristocracy remained remarkably vigorous, at least in the social and political spheres. Agricultural methods on the aristocratic estates were improving more toward the end of the century than the author assumes. Moreover, Mr. Bruford condemns mercantilism too severely in calling it "dilettante," and the reviewer finds unhistorical his criticism of the Prussian government as being too centralized. The picture of the Württemberg Landtag leaves an erroneous impression; the body was far from being liberal or representative. Also, the reviewer fears that the condensed analysis of the Prussian bureaucracy will never be understood by students without much further study, and he recommends the inclusion in the bibliography of Otto Hintze's masterly study of the bureaucracy in the *Acta Borussica*. It may seem pedantic to mention omissions in the bibliography; the titles given are varied and are well selected to cover the field; but the reviewer would like to add those of a few books which he has found useful: Otto Hintze's works, Treitschke's *Bundesstaat und Einheitsstaat*, Windelband's *Karl Friedrich von Baden*, Ziekursch's *Hundert Jahre Schlesischer Agrargeschichte*, and Kirchner's *Die Grundlagen des deutschen Zeitschriftenwesens*.

These criticisms should not obscure the fact that Mr. Bruford's volume provides students of the eighteenth century with a better guide than they have in any other period of modern German history. We need many more like it.

American University
Washington, D.C.

EUGENE N. ANDERSON

William Cullen Bryant: representative selections. With introduction, bibliography, and notes. By TREMAINE McDOWELL. New York: American Book Co., 1935. Pp. lxxxii+426.

This volume of selections from Bryant is a valuable addition to the "American writers series." Besides a judicious selection from Bryant's poetry, there is a generous representation of his prose, including the illuminating *Lectures on poetry*, some of the more important travel letters, several tales, and a number of reviews and editorials. Three useful appendixes have been provided, one containing uncollected or unpublished verse "of historical and biographical interest," another listing Bryant's literary articles and addresses, a third presenting contemporary criticism of the poet. Valuable, too, is the mass of data concerning Bryant's revisions made available in the notes. In view of these things it is to be regretted that the introduction is not wholly above objection.

The editor begins very deftly with a picture of Bryant at the age of thirteen, already a versifier, delivering his valedictory in the township school at Cummington, Massachusetts. He points out that at this age Bryant was "a Federalist, a Calvinist, and a Classicist," and thereupon introduces his thesis: "The stages whereby Bryant the youth and the man moved steadily away from this acquired conservatism toward Democracy, Unitarianism, and Romanticism form the chapters in the history of his mind and of his art" (pp. xv-xvi). For this statement ample support may be found in the poet's life and work. In developing the part of it relating to Bryant's religious views, Professor McDowell has not, however, always made the most of that evidence, and he has in several instances obscured it by questionable interpretations of his text, or confused the issue by failing to distinguish precisely between the schools of thought in the New England of Bryant's day.

In presenting evidence of Bryant's early acceptance of Calvinism, for example, he fails to utilize the statement in the poet's uncompleted autobiography: "The Calvinistic system of divinity I adopted, of course, as I heard nothing else taught from the pulpit, and supposed it to be the accepted belief of the religious world" (Parke Godwin, *A biography of William Cullen Bryant*, I, 26-27). Instead he exhibits a passage from the poem recited by Bryant at the end of the school year in 1804: "Here," he writes, "the boy

ignored the incipient Unitarianism of that day and definitely accepted the orthodox creed of his community:

Then let us tread, as lowly Jesus trod,
The path that leads the sinner to his God;
Keep Heaven's bright mansions ever in our eyes,
Press tow'rds the mark and seize the glorious prize" [p. xiv].

Unfortunately, these lines contain no indication that young Bryant ignored Unitarianism or that he definitely accepted Calvinism. There is no expression of belief in the "five thorny points of Calvinism"—not even an assertion of trinitarian faith. No phrase in the stanza would have stuck in the throat of William Ellery Channing, soon to be recognized as the leader of the Unitarian movement. In fact, as late as 1834, when Unitarianism was no longer "incipient," Channing in a sermon on "The future life" urged men to make heaven "an object of deep interest, earnest hope, constant pursuit"; described the eternal blessedness of the spirits which Christ had guided "through a world of sore temptation"; and asked, "Shall our worldliness and unforsaken sins, separate us, by a gulf which cannot be passed, from the society of Heaven?" (See *Works* [Boston, 1869], IV, 222, 235-36.) In short, any interpretation of Bryant's verses which makes it possible to regard them as an avowal of Calvinism and a rejection of Unitarianism will oblige one to conclude that Channing was in reality orthodox.

This failure to distinguish precisely between the New England orthodoxy of Bryant's day and the rising Unitarianism of the time weakens much of what is said about Bryant's liberalism in the section of the introduction contrasting his mature views with those he had acquired in his youth. As evidence of Bryant's "early abandonment of the Calvinism of his boyhood," Professor McDowell points, for instance, to the poet's later belief that the "'perpetual work' of creation . . . is 'renewed forever'" (p. xxix); to his confidence that "in the long conflict between this goodness and the evil which is also manifest in humanity, goodness will eventually triumph and man will eventually be perfected," so that "'love and peace shall make their paradise with man'" (p. xxx); to his faith that God "was not as much a God of anger as a champion of justice and liberty and truth" (p. xxviii). But it would be difficult indeed to justify the assertion that at these points Bryant was deserting Calvinism. Jonathan Edwards' disciple, Samuel Hopkins, whose *System of doctrines* (1793) had been an important instrument in molding the New England orthodoxy of Bryant's day, had taken pains to prove "continued creation," deeming it "a great and dangerous error" to assert that "creatures, once made and put in order, go on in a regular course of their own accord" (*Works* [Boston, 1854], I, 164-67; see also Jonathan Edwards, *Works* [1858], II, 487-89). He had prophesied that the diffusion of Christianity would bring "a time of universal peace, love, and general and cordial friendship" (*Works*, II, 275 ff.; see also Edwards, *Works*, I, 481 ff.), although, in his

view, this would be followed by a period of "general corruption." Far from conceiving of the Deity "as a God of anger," he proclaimed "infinite benevolence" and "infinite love" as the fundamental characteristics of the divine nature, insisting that references in the Scripture to God's anger must not be interpreted so as to ascribe to the Deity human passions or "passions contrary to love" (*Works*, I, 49, 53). That, furthermore, he conceived of God as a champion of justice and liberty is clear from his solemn warning to his countrymen that they were incurring the "displeasure of Heaven" in enslaving the negro (*Works*, II, 617 ff.). Bryant could hardly have been unaware of the Hopkinsian system. He himself states in his fragment of autobiography that his grandfather, with whom the family lived after 1799, was an exponent of the system of "Dr. Samuel Hopkins, who at that time had many disciples in the New England churches," and that his uncle, Rev. Thomas Snell, with whom he lived while preparing for college, had been "trained in the school of Dr. Hopkins, which then, I think, included most of the country ministers of the Congregational Church in Massachusetts" (*Parke Godwin*, I, 9, 28). In short, Bryant would seem to have been hardly more liberal with respect to the doctrines mentioned above than his Calvinistic grandfather and uncle.

That Bryant did forsake his early orthodox belief there can, of course, be no doubt. As Professor McDowell points out, he became a member of the Unitarian church. It is regrettable that his present editor has given support to popular misconceptions of New England Calvinism instead of reporting the results of an examination of the poet's work with respect to the points really at issue between Calvinists and Unitarians—such points, for example, as those outlined by Channing in sermons like "Unitarian Christianity" (1809) and "Objections to Unitarian Christianity considered" (1819), or presented in the controversy between Channing and Samuel Worcester in 1815.

C. H. FAUST

University of Chicago

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Angol Filológiai Tanulmányok, Vol. I. Budapest, 1936. Pp. 128.
- BABBITT, THEODORE. "La Cronica de Veinte Reyes," a comparison with the text of the "Primera Cronica general," and a study of the principal Latin sources. ("Yale Romanic studies," Vol. XIII.) New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936. Pp. 172.
- BALDACCHINI, SAVERIO. *Purismo e romanticismo*. A cura di EDMONDO CIONE. ("Biblioteca di cultura moderna.") Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1936. Pp. xxxv+229.
- Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*. Edited by FR. KLAEBER. 3d ed. New York: D. C. Heath & Co., [1936]. Pp. clxxxvii+444.
- BIANGUIS, GENEVIÈVE. *Histoire de la littérature allemande*. ("Collection Armand Colin, Section de langues et littératures.") Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1936. Pp. 216.
- The book of Apollonius*. Translated into English verse by RAYMOND L. GRISMER and ELIZABETH ATKINS. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1936. Pp. xx+113.
- CASTRO, AMÉRICO. *Glosarios latino-españoles de la edad media*. ("Revista de filología española," Anejo XXII.) Madrid, 1936. Pp. lxxxvii+378.
- CAZAMIAN, LOUIS. *Symbolism and poetry*. Reprinted from the *University of Toronto quarterly*, V, No. 4 (July, 1936), 520-43.
- Dialect notes*, Vol. VI, Part XI. ("Publications of the American Dialect Society," ed. MILES L. HANLEY.) New Haven, Conn.: American Dialect Society, December, 1935. Pp. 481-512.
- A *dictionary of American English on historical principles*. Edited by SIR WILLIAM CRAIGIE, with the collaboration of JAMES R. HULBERT, GEORGE WATSON, MITFORD M. MATHEWS, ALLEN WALKER READ. Part I, A-Baggage. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [1936]. Pp. xii+116.
- FINNEY, CLAUDE LEE. *The evolution of Keats's poetry*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936. 2 vols.
- FLETCHER, EDWARD G. *The beginnings of the professional theatre in Texas*. ("University of Texas Bulletin," No. 3621.) Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, 1936. Pp. 55.
- GAPP, SAMUEL VOGT. *George Gissing, classicist*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1936. Pp. 210.
- HANDRO, LILLI. *Swift: "Gulliver's travels," eine Interpretation im Zusammenhang mit den geistesgeschichtlichen Beziehungen*. ("Brittanica," Heft 12.) Hamburg: Friederichsen, De Gruyter & Co., 1936. Pp. 165.
- HASTINGS, HESTER. *Man and beast in French thought of the eighteenth century*. ("Johns Hopkins studies in Romance literatures and languages," Vol. XXVII.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1936. Pp. 297.
- HAWKINS, RICHMOND LAURIN. *Auguste Comte and the United States (1816-1853)*. ("Harvard studies in Romance languages," Vol. XI.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936. Pp. 147.
- HERMANNSSON, HALLDÖR. *The problem of Wineland*. ("Islandica," Vol. XXV.) Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1936. Pp. 84.
- JÖRDER, OTTO. *Die Formen des Sonetts bei Lope de Vega*. ("Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie," Heft 86.) Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1936. Pp. xii+372.
- JOHNSON, MARGARET LEAH. *Beaumont's marchais and his opponents: new documents on his lawsuits*. Columbia dissertation. Privately printed, [1936]. Pp. xvi+278.
- KELLY, JOHN ALEXANDER. *German visitors to English theaters in the eighteenth century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1936. Pp. 178.

- KREMPIEN, HANS-HELLMUT. *Der Stil der "Davideis" von Abraham Cowley im Kreise ihrer Vorläufer: ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung des "metaphysical wit" und des Epos vor Milton.* ("Britannica," Heft 11.) Hamburg: Friederichsen, De Gruyter & Co., 1936. Pp. 147.
- KÜNTZBERG, EBERHARD FRHR. VON. *Lesestücke zur rechtlichen Volkskunde.* ("Grundriss der deutschen Volkskunde in Einzeldarstellungen," Ergänzungssreihe, Band I.) Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1936. Pp. 60.
- KÜNTZBERG, EBERHARD FRHR. VON. *Rechtliche Volkskunde.* ("Grundriss der deutschen Volkskunde in Einzeldarstellungen," Band III.) Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1936. Pp. 194, with 19 plates.
- LINTHICUM, M. CHANNING. *Costume in the drama of Shakespeare and his contemporaries.* Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1936. Pp. viii+307.
- MONTAIGNE, MICHEL DE. *The essays of Michel de Montaigne*, Vol. III. Trans. and ed. JACOB ZEITLIN. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1936. Pp. 581.
- PAIN, PHILIP. *Daily meditations.* Reproduced from the original edition of 1668 in the Huntington Library. With an introduction by LEON HOWARD. San Marino, Calif.: Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, 1936. Pp. 36.
- RASCH, WOLFDIETRICH. *Freundschaftskult und Freundschaftsdichtung im deutschen Schrifttum des 18. Jahrhunderts.* ("Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte," Buchreihe, Band XXI.) Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1936. Pp. 266.
- ROBINSON, DAVID M. *Pindar, a poet of eternal ideas.* ("The Johns Hopkins University studies in archaeology," No. 21.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1936. Pp. vi+118.
- ROEDDER, EDWIN. *Volksprache und Wortschatz des Badischen Frankenlandes, dargestellt auf Grund der Mundart von Oberschefflenz.* New York: Modern Language Association, 1936. Pp. xxv+606.
- ROOTH, ERIK. *Det primära i-omljudet och frågan om muljerade konsonanter och i-epenteser i väst och nordgermanskan.* ("Årsbok, 1935: Yearbook of the New Society of Letters at Lund.") Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, [1935]. Pp. 34.
- ROY, P. N. *Italian influence on the poetry of Tennyson.* Benares: Uttara Press, [1936]. Pp. 75.
- SALE, ANTOINE DE LA. *Œuvres complètes*, Tome I: *La salade*. Edition critique par FERNAND DESONAY. ("Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège," Fasc. LXVIII.) Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1935. Pp. xlv+268.
- SCHMITT, LUDWIG ERICH. *Die deutsche Urkundensprache in der Kanzlei Kaiser Karls IV (1346-1378).* ("Zeitschrift für Mundartforschung," Beiheft XV; "Mitteldeutsche Studien," Heft 11.) Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1936. Pp. xv+226.
- SPECKBAUGH, PAUL F. *Some general canons of literary criticism determined from an analysis of art.* Washington: Catholic University of America, 1936. Pp. xvi+193.
- STOLL, ELMER EDGAR. *The tragic fallacy, so-called.* Reprinted from the *University of Toronto quarterly*, V, No. 4 (July, 1936), 457-81.
- TASSO, TORQUATO. *Rinaldo.* A cura di LUIGI BONFIGLI. ("Scrittori d'Italia.") Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1936. Pp. 370.
- TINKER, EDWARD LAROCQUE. *Gombo, the Creole dialect of Louisiana; together with a bibliography.* Reprinted from the *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, April, 1935. Worcester, Mass., 1936. Pp. 46.
- VAIL, CURTIS C. D. *Lessing's relation to the English language and literature.* ("Columbia University Germanic studies," N.S., No. 3.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1936. Pp. 220.
- VAN DAM, B. A. P. *The text of Shakespeare's "Lear."* ("Materials for the study of the Old English drama," Vol. X.) Louvain: Librairie Universitaire, 1935. Pp. 110.
- WEEKLEY, ERNEST. *Something about words.* New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1936. Pp. 233.
- ZWIRNER, EBERHARD, and ZWIRNER, KURT. *Grundfragen der Phonometrie.* ("Phonometrische Forschungen," Reihe A, Band I.) Berlin: Verlag Metten & Co., 1936. Pp. xi+140.

SPECIAL NOTICE

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES GRANTS-IN-AID OF RESEARCH

The American Council of Learned Societies is able to offer a limited number of small grants, ordinarily not exceeding three hundred dollars, to individual scholars to assist them in carrying on definite projects of research, already begun, in the humanistic sciences: philosophy, philology, literature and linguistics, art and musicology, archaeology, and cultural and intellectual history. Applicants must possess the doctorate or its equivalent, must be citizens or permanent residents of the United States or Canada, and must be in personal need of the assistance for which they apply and unable to secure it from other sources. Grants are not awarded for the fulfilment of requirements for any academic degree.

Applications must be made in duplicate on special forms which will be supplied on request, and must be filed before January 15, 1937. For further information and for application forms, address the Secretary for Fellowships and Grants, American Council of Learned Societies, 907 Fifteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.